UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY CIVIL ACTION NO 16-MD-2738 (FLW) (LHG)

IN RE JOHNSON & JOHNSON : TRANSCRIPT OF
POWDER PRODUCTS MARKETING, : STATUS CONFERENCE

SALES PRACTICES.

-----: SEPTEMBER 6, 2017

CLARKSON S. FISHER UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE 402 EAST STATE STREET, TRENTON, NJ 08608

B E F O R E: THE HONORABLE FREDA L. WOLFSON, USDJ THE HONORABLE LOIS H. GOODMAN, USMJ

APPEARANCES:

BEASLEY ALLEN, ESQUIRES

BY: P. LEIGH O'DELL, ESQUIRE (ALABAMA)

-and-

ASHCRAFT & GEREL, ESQUIRES

BY: MICHELLE A. PARFITT, ESQUIRE (VIRGINIA)

CHRIS TISI, ESQUIRE (VIRGINIA)

-and-

COHEN, PLACITELLA & ROTH, ESQUIRES

BY: CHRISTOPHER M. PLACITELLA, ESQUIRE

On Behalf of the Plaintiffs Steering Committee

DRINKER, BIDDLE & REATH, ESQUIRES

BY: SUSAN M. SHARKO, ESQUIRE

-and-

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON, ESQUIRES

BY: PATRICK L. OOT, ESQUIRE (WASHINGTON, D.C.)

-and-

SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM, ESQUIRES

BY: JOHN H. BEISNER, ESQUIRE (WASHINGTON, D.C.)

On behalf of Defendant Johnson & Johnson

* * * * *

VINCENT RUSSONIELLO, RPR, CRR, CCR OFFICIAL U.S. COURT REPORTER (609) 588-9516

APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

SEYFARRTH & SHAW, ESQUIRES

BY: THOMAS L. LOCKE, ESQUIRE (WASHINGTON D.C.)

-and
THE AXELROD FIRM, ESQUIRES

BY: SHERYL L. AXELROD, ESQUIRE (PENNSYLVANIA)
On Behalf of Defendant PCPC

COUGHLIN DUFFY, ESQUIRES
BY: LORNA A. DOTRO, ESQUIRE
 MARK K. SILVER, ESQUIRE
 -andGORDON & REES, ESQUIRES
BY: ANN THORNTON FIELD, ESQUIRE (PENNSYLVANIA)

NANCY M. ERFLE, ESQUIRE (OREGON)
On behalf of Defendant Imerys Talc America

CERTIFICATE

PURSUANT TO TITLE 28, U.S.C., SECTION 753, THE FOLLOWING TRANSCRIPT IS CERTIFIED TO BE AN ACCURATE TRANSCRIPTION OF MY STENOGRAPHIC NOTES IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER.

S/Vincent Russoniello
VINCENT RUSSONIELLO, CCR
OFFICIAL U.S. COURT REPORTER

4 THE CLERK: All rise. 1 2 JUDGE WOLFSON: Thank you. (Appearances are given.) 3 4 5 JUDGE WOLFSON: On the record. I think instead of following through in the 6 7 order of your status letter, which is normally what I 8 do, I think it is better instead to go right to the scope of discovery and what was my intent when I got 9 10 on the phone with you last week as to what the scope 11 is. 12 Let me start by saying, no, it was not limited 13 to asbestos. So let me make that clear. I'm sorry if I gave some doubt to that. Where I am is, and I can 14 certainly go through each of the ones that the 15 plaintiff has identified, but it is much broader. 16 Ιt 17 includes information or knowledge of J&J as to a number of these things. 18 I think all of this, and part of my reason for 19 broadening the discovery, and maybe I've had some 20 21 interest in doing so at the beginning as well and 22 perhaps it was being too narrowly construed, but I do 23 think also some of these matters could impact what 24 studies were being done at the time, if there was any 25 influence, who was involved.

```
5
            For instance, if you have whether it's J&J or
1
 2
    the other entities somehow involved in other groups
 3
    that are performing the studies, I always said the
    issue of bias in the studies is going to be an
 4
    important issue and I am going to allow these.
 5
 6
            The only thing we're really not doing right
 7
    now is specific causation issues. But I would like to
8
    go through the topics to make sure what I've got on
    really the relevance of each one of these.
 9
            "Cornstarch and/or cornstarch products."
10
            What's that about, an alternative?
11
12
            MS. O'DELL: It's a safer alternative for talc
13
    in the product. We believe we have the right to
14
    discover all of that and our experts need to know that
    because in many states they will need to opine on what
15
    would be a safer alternative design of the product.
16
17
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Okay.
            "The closure of mines, mills, process,
18
    facilities, et cetera."
19
20
            Now, I was curious. Did J&J actually have
21
    some mines?
22
            MS. O'DELL: Yes, your Honor. There is
23
    information regarding decisions to close mines or to
    not source talc for the talcum powder products because
24
25
    of asbestos and other carcinogens within the ore body.
```

```
6
            So we want to discover all that. If a mine
1
 2
    was closed because of that, and that mine was used as
 3
    a source for the talcum powder products, we want to
    discover that.
 4
 5
            JUDGE WOLFSON: How long ago were those
 6
    closures?
 7
            MS. O'DELL: Some in the '70s, some earlier.
 8
    It depends on the specific mine. But they would have
 9
    been within the zone of usage for many of the women.
            JUDGE WOLFSON:
                             That's what my question was.
10
11
            Let's go through all of these and then I'll
12
    make some comments.
            "Drill logs from mines and other documents."
13
14
            These are again the J&J mines?
            MS. O'DELL: As well as Imerys mines.
15
16
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Okay.
17
            Because I know this is under your J&J
18
    defendant category. But I'm assuming with regard to
    Imerys, there is not going to be a dispute about this
19
20
    anyway. Correct?
21
            MR. SILVER: I'm sorry. What was the
22
    question?
23
            JUDGE WOLFSON:
                            It says, "Drill logs from
24
    mines and other documents."
            You never had an issue about it. Correct?
25
```

```
7
            MR. SILVER: No, your Honor.
1
 2
            JUDGE WOLFSON: This is related to J&J mines.
 3
    So now it's getting the same kind of things from the
    J&J mines. Okay.
 4
 5
            "Meetings with advisory committees or
 6
    third-party consultants."
 7
            What does that mean?
 8
            MS. O'DELL: It relates to consultants or
 9
    advisory boards that were considering the issue of
    whether the products cause cancer, and we want to
10
    discover those communications in documents. That's
11
12
    what the discovery request was specifically targeted
    to those issues.
13
14
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Thank you.
            And then I guess there was a sale of Shower To
15
16
    Shower at some point to Valeant and you are saying if
17
    there were documents that would reflect issues related
    to the product in connection with the sale and how
18
    that could impact the sale and if there were such
19
20
    documents reflecting that. Is that what that really
21
    is?
22
            MS. O'DELL: Yes.
23
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Okay.
24
            What are the "Board of Director
25
    communications"?
```

```
8
            MS. O'DELL: Well, the specific request was
1
 2
    for "Communications of the Board of Directors or
 3
    subcommittees of the Board of Directors relating to
    the safety of talcum powder products and specifically
 4
    the ovarian cancer risks."
 5
 6
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Okay. I don't know why you
 7
    wouldn't get that.
 8
            "Communications with Mr. Zazenski at Imerys."
            MS. O'DELL: Mr. Zazenski, among other things,
 9
    wrote a document that suggested cornstarch was a safer
10
    alternative for the design of the talcum powder
11
12
    products. And if cornstarch were not substituted for
13
    talc, a warning should have been added to the bottle.
14
    He is a person that is in a number of documents --
15
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Who was he? What was his
16
    position?
17
            MS. O'DELL: Product safety for Imerys.
18
            JUDGE WOLFSON: No longer employed? Is he
    deceased?
19
20
            MS. O'DELL: He's deceased.
21
            MS. ERFLE: He has been deceased since 2008.
22
            JUDGE WOLFSON: "The definition of pure talc."
23
            MS. O'DELL: It's our position, your Honor,
    that there is no such thing as pure talc. And to a
24
25
    degree that there have been representations regarding
```

```
Johnson defendants purchasing talc from Imerys and
1
 2
    others? Are there indemnity agreements that are a
 3
    part of that? If there is liability for cases
    involving ovarian cancer.
 4
 5
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Where I am at this point is,
 6
    the general subject matters can be discovered.
 7
    not going to deal with the exact parameters. I'm
 8
    going to leave that to your disputes, your specific
    requests that you can present to Judge Pisano.
            I am allowing the general discovery requests.
10
    I'm not making any ruling today on indemnity
11
12
    agreements or anything of that nature. I'll leave
13
    that for the specifics to see what they look like.
14
    I'm not so sure that's relevant to where we are today.
    And certainly some of these things I think would be
15
    limited, but the subject matters I'll permit.
16
17
            So now with that you can tee-up up your
    discovery issues.
18
            MR. OOT: Just a point of clarification.
19
                                                       So
    for these subject matters, the general theory is
20
21
    discoverable. But we'll work with Judge Pisano to
22
    narrow it?
23
            JUDGE WOLFSON: On the scope of it, right.
    there are ones that are going beyond or if they're too
24
25
    broad, right, exactly.
```

than once. So if you have disputes about areas that that same person would be asked questions about, I don't want to have that happen. Depositions are a separate question at the moment. I'm trying to deal with the written discovery

22

23

24

```
Case 3:16-md-02738-MAS-RLS Document 791 Filed 09/19/17 Page 12 of 62 PageID: 5326
                                                                  12
          first. But I am going to give you some timelines
       1
       2
          today for both written discovery and depositions.
       3
                  MS. O'DELL: Okay. Thank you.
                   JUDGE WOLFSON: Yes, Ms. Sharko.
       4
                  MS. SHARKO: I'm a little confused and I think
       5
       6
          we need unfortunately a little more clarity.
       7
                  JUDGE WOLFSON: Sure.
       8
                  MS. SHARKO: The areas that you enunciated
          are, in general, fair game for discovery as it relates
       9
      10
          to ovarian cancer, and the parties need to work out
          the parameters of that. It's not everything, every
      11
          last piece of paper, every last whatever.
      12
      13
                   JUDGE WOLFSON: Nothing is every last piece of
      14
          paper because as in any discovery we know there are
          limits to it. So, yes, that's why I'm not ruling on
      15
          any specifics today.
      16
      17
                   I'm saying the subject matters are
          appropriate. You have to review what the requests
      18
      19
          are. You decide if they are overbroad or not and we
      20
          go from there.
      21
                  MS. SHARKO: And apply the rules of
      22
          proportionality and all that.
```

JUDGE WOLFSON: All the rules still apply to

this case. The rules of civil procedure apply. So

23

24

25

that's where we are.

Now, with that, let's go back to some of the specific issues that you are raising.

Now, I understand you will be re-reviewing I guess the written discovery requests, that some of the prior objections may not apply, and I think you need to do some more conferring.

Let me deal with all written discovery first and then I'll talk about depositions with you.

Third-party subpoenas. I guess there were some issues about not who is being deposed but the areas that you are identifying for those. Is that correct?

MS. O'DELL: In terms of the request, your
Honor, I think the only outstanding issue relates to
-- there are two actually. The foreign regulatory
agencies and what was happening with trade
associations in Europe. That was briefed in the joint
letter.

So what the parties have done, we served subpoenas without those requests that were subject to objection to get things moving. But there was an issue in the joint letter that related to those foreign regulatory and trade associations. And if my memory serves, there were some specific entities that were included in the Colorado School of Mines

subpoena. 1 2 JUDGE WOLFSON: At this point, having the 3 discover master, I'm not going to go into the nitty-gritty of what those are. That's an issue, 4 again, that should be teed-up for Judge Pisano. 5 You've reached agreement with regard to the 6 7 Bristol-Myers ruling and there is a stipulation I 8 understand that you want to enter with regard to all these cases that are listed in Exhibit 1. But I 9 understand there are a couple of cases for which you 10 still are pursuing the remand on. 11 12 MS. O'DELL: There are three cases, your Honor. In each of those cases there is a state 13 14 defendant. So the cases were filed in the resident 15 state of the plaintiff. There is an in-state defendant and --16 17 JUDGE WOLFSON: And I guess the argument is going to be whether that's a real defendant or not or 18 simply joined to destroy diversity. So those are 19 going forward. 20 21 MS. O'DELL: Yes. There are three of those 22 cases. 23 JUDGE WOLFSON: Okay. So we can enter the 24 Exhibit 1.

Let me talk for a moment about the

Mehaffey-Weber memo. I've read myself the papers that
were submitted in connection with this memo which
included the affidavit of Mr. Williams and fairly
limited briefing frankly on the issue.

I must tell you, my initial reaction is that particularly some of the comments that were made on it clearly seem that litigation is out there in some way. I think just on its face, it seems to be a document that could be protected by one of the privileges. But I really don't have quite enough.

Second of all, what does concern me, though, there are a lot of other issues involved with it. But one is also I do not believe that the submissions by J&J adequately tell me the protections that were taken from not producing this because this was produced in more than one place is my understanding.

MR. OOT: Thank you, your Honor.

So our position related to waiver is first prefaced by the violation of 26(b)(5)(B) and I think it's very important. I'm glad that your Honor said the rules apply.

But here what's happened is they have essentially taken our privileged document, filed it in this case, and now we have an existing claw back and they continue to violate the rule under 26(b)(5)(B).

And now exactly what's happening here, your Honor, they want the Court to jump to whether or not the document is privileged.

I would like to actually have a pause first and really realize that 26(b)(5)(B) applies and we are entitled to claw that back that until we have this discussion of whether or not the document is privileged.

MR. TISI: Your Honors, Chris Tisi for the plaintiffs.

I don't have the language of the order in front of me. It gives the plaintiffs certain protections. If a claw back has has been issued, as was done in this case, we reserve the right to bring the matter to the Court, which is exactly what we have done. In fact, it's been on the past three agendas for the Court.

I think it's important to remember the reason why this particular document among many was brought to the Court's attention. If you go back to the status conference in February, the issue was whether or not there has been an adequate document production in this case.

Your Honor instructed the plaintiffs, instructed me to go back to the defense and say to

```
them, Tell the defense with some particularity the concerns you have with the productions that they've made.

So we have this as an example, this 1998 memo
```

as an example of the reasons why we believe that certain documents were not produced in this litigation. So we sent them this letter for that purpose.

The reason why it becomes really important is because this document is almost -- I've used the term Rosetta Stone. It really demonstrates, it gives us a snapshot in time, as to what documents were collected, what documents were there in 1998, and we still have not been able to get our arms around it.

JUDGE WOLFSON: Let me ask a question. How are you taking care of this issue with the documents that existed in 1998?

MR. OOT: So in a letter that -- a copy of a letter that I sent to Mr. Tisi in response to his Friday at 5:30 letter, I outlined all of the efforts that we took to location the documents.

So what this issue is, your Honor, they're talking about a cardboard box. We're not necessarily talking about missing documents.

JUDGE WOLFSON: I understood what you said.

You said the boxes themselves don't exist anymore.
We've archived them. We've done different things.

What my inquiry really is, is to make sure that everything that was available back in '98 and that's still available is being produced. And if it is not available, a description or explanation as to what happened to it and what the chain of custody was.

And so my real issue is, what was done for you to confirm what happened to those documents in this time? I don't know what's happened there. I'm not suggesting today that I'm going to go through this because it's not my job to be the discovery master at the moment.

I'm trying to get a feel to give you also some views of what some of my concerns are. So that if you are going to present this to Judge Pisano for a report and recommendation to me, you know the things I want addressed. I don't want this to go on for months.

MR. TISI: Your Honor, there is one issue that came up since we initially briefed this. If you go back and take a look at the notes from the last three status conferences, one of the issues that came up, apart from the privilege claims on this letter, was whether or not the documents described in the memo have been produced.

```
JUDGE GOODMAN: Can I stop you? Can you just
1
 2
    tell me, is it documents we are talking about or a
 3
    physical box we're talking about?
            MR. TISI: I don't care about the boxes.
 4
    boxes are irrelevant and candidly that's a bit of a
 5
 6
    red herring.
 7
            What happened, if you look at the document,
 8
    the memo itself, what happened was over a year period
    of time people went back into the record archives and
 9
10
    if you look at paragraph one of the memo it describes
11
    this.
12
            They went back into the archives, the
13
    regulatory archives and the research archives, and
14
    they retrieved not only boxes but notebooks, and
    interviewed people who brought their own files to the
15
16
    table.
17
            Now, two things happened: No. 1, is they
    categorized and they described the boxes:
18
            So for Bill Ashton there were something in the
19
20
    range of 44 boxes.
21
            For Ms. Galligher there were various notebooks
22
    including bi-monthly testing of talc samples.
23
            For Mr. Molinar there were his own personal
24
    files and eight additional boxes.
25
            So what this document does is categorize what
```

```
was collected. And what was important about this was,
1
 2
    it was all related to the issue of whether talc causes
    cancer, ovarian cancer back in 1997/1998.
 3
            This other thing that was done was that
 4
 5
    counsel apparently pulled from the boxes -- and this
    is in the first paragraph of that document -- pulled
 6
 7
    from the boxes various documents that related to talc
 8
    and cancer and marked them. And if you look at
    footnote 1 of the memo, and I have a copy of it.
            JUDGE WOLFSON: I have the memo.
10
            MR. TISI: If you look at No. 1, if you look
11
12
    at the memo on page 1, it says, "Each has" --
            MR. OOT: We're in open court and he's reading
13
14
    a privileged document right now. We're still entitled
    to 26(b)(5)(B).
15
16
            JUDGE WOLFSON: I understand. I have the
17
    footnote, though. So all it is, is just the coding
    system for documents. By the way, frankly, that
18
    coding thing is really not protected.
19
20
            MR. TISI: But the point, your Honor, is even
21
    if the boxes don't exist anymore as they were at the
22
    time, candidly we have some concerns about it because
    they had preservation requirements back in 1998.
23
24
            JUDGE WOLFSON: By the way, what was this
```

Coker litigation? That's what Mr. Williams put in an

```
affidavit to say why this was done in anticipation of
1
 2
    litigation. No one talked to him about his affidavit?
 3
            That's what you produced in this motion:
    "Affidavit of Gene Williams. I served as counsel in
 4
    the matter of Darlene Coker and spouse Ray Coker v.
 5
    Bill Thames Pharmacy, Inc., which at the time was
 6
 7
    pending against a number of Johnson & Johnson
 8
    subsidiaries in the 136th Judicial District Court of
    Jefferson County, Texas."
            That's his whole position, that this was done
10
    for Coker, and he calls them the "Coker coding
11
12
    sheets."
13
            MS. SHARKO: We can find that out. I think no
14
    one anticipated actually arguing this motion today,
    but we'll find that out.
15
16
            MR. TISI: Your Honor, the key point, and I
17
    think it's important to bring this out, is that they
    pulled documents from these files, made photocopies of
18
    them. Presumably those photocopies continue to exist.
19
20
            So whether or not the boxes exist or not,
21
    those documents that were pulled, we have no way of
22
    knowing them until they produce them.
23
            JUDGE WOLFSON: My understanding is, they said
24
    they are going to produce the documents.
25
            MR. TISI: Well, we don't know whether they
```

have or they haven't. This is candidly why this has been a little bit frustrating, because up until the 22nd of August, we had been under the impression they provided us with a spreadsheet which was represented to us and represented candidly to your Honor was an accounting of where we could go to recreate the boxes in the production that we already had.

So there is an eight or 16 page spreadsheet that talks about Bates range of X to Y. If you go to the documents, this was part of the boxes. And it was keyed to the phrases in this 1998 document which gave us the impression that all we had to do is simply go back into our production, pull those documents, put them in a stack and we would have what's referenced in this 1998 document.

We went back. You want to talk about time and labor. We went back. Ms. O'Dell went back and her office pulled a lot of these documents. A lot of them post-dated the memo. A lot of them were things that could not possibly have been in that file.

We were representing that to your Honor the past three conferences. We were representing to your Honor that we were working this out. All that was really at issue at the end was the 1998 memo itself. But the documents referenced in the memo, counsel was

working it out.

On at the 22nd of August, Ms. O'Dell and I got on the phone with Mr. Oot and Ms. Frazier and it was told to us for the very first time that these documents, what was referenced in the spreadsheet was not what was in the boxes.

What was referenced in the spreadsheet was, these were the kinds of documents that would have been in the boxes had we had them. We didn't know until about two weeks ago that the boxes did not exist.

In the meantime they have been litigating this issue in state court and represented to the state court Judge. There is actually a state court order ordering them to produce the boxes, the notebooks, the files containing this memo. At no point did J&J ever represent to me -- and I went back and looked. I'm pretty careful about this stuff. I went back and looked and said, Could I have missed something?

I went back and looked at the status conference reports, at the emails that were sent to me, the spreadsheet, and in each and every instance -- and I have them with me if your Honor wants to look at them -- in each and every instance what was represented to me was that the spreadsheet that was provided would allow plaintiffs to recreate what was

2.4

in those boxes. 1 2 Why is that important, your Honor? No. 1 it's a snapshot in time of what was known by the company. 3 4 No. 2, we're very -- and I'll say it 5 outright -- we're very concerned that documents that existed at one time when the company was aware there 6 7 was an issue relating to talc and ovarian cancer no 8 longer exist. We have asked them -- and I sent a letter last 9 week following up on our conference on the 22nd -- at 10 the very least you should produce to us those 11 12 documents that were pulled from the boxes and coded as 13 indicated in footnote 1. I got a letter from Mr. Oot 14 this morning that I was reading on my phone as I was 15 coming to court. There was no reference to that 16 request. 17 Your Honor, it's a real concern to us that there was a collection of materials and documents 18 related to the very issues in this case almost 19 20 20 years ago. 21 JUDGE WOLFSON: I have your argument. 22 MR. OOT: Your Honor, that's just not true, 23 first of all. 24 JUDGE WOLFSON: Tell me what the spreadsheet

was.

```
MR. OOT: So when we originally met and
1
 2
    conferred, we agreed that we would go back into the
    legacy archive, which is a very large volume of
 3
    documents, and we would have a human reviewer go and
 4
    location ranges where these documents would be located
 5
    and that's what the spreadsheet is.
 6
 7
            JUDGE WOLFSON: I don't understand. Help me
 8
    out here. First of all, if I take the way it's
 9
    described that the documents back in 1998 were
    labeled, this coding system was set up for initials
10
    that would reflect documents from different
11
12
    individuals. Correct?
13
            MR. OOT: Under the memo, yes, your Honor.
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Which they photocopied. Does
14
    that coding system appear anywhere on the documents or
15
    in the archives?
16
17
            MR. OOT: No, your Honor.
            JUDGE WOLFSON: They don't.
18
            MR. OOT: No, because of the documents went
19
20
    back into circulation. The documents then get scanned
21
    to a very large legacy archive where it's not
22
    delineated by box number. Again, we're talking, this
23
    is back in 1998, much different than the litigation
24
    technology that we are talking about now.
25
            JUDGE WOLFSON: I know what 1998 was like.
                                                         Ι
```

1 understand.

MR. OOT: It's before I was a lawyer, your Honor.

JUDGE WOLFSON: I was a Magistrate Judge at the time. I know how it works. I'm trying to figure out how it was done here. We're not talking the dark ages. So let's be clear about it.

I'm trying to figure out what was done to preserve the documents and to label them in some way and identify who they came from and where they were maintained.

For instance, there are references here whether documents were -- some individuals kept personal files. Others had them in a more general fashion, and both kinds were being produced.

Again, I don't know what the Coker litigation was. We don't know if it was an ovarian cancer case or not back in '98. I have no idea. Does anybody know what the Coker litigation was?

MR. TISI: We have not been able to find that out, your Honor.

JUDGE WOLFSON: Okay. It would have been nice if Mr. Williams had told us.

But we've got some litigation. We're
obviously obtaining these documents and at least some

of the references would indicate that it was one of the issues of concern. There were discussions of asbestos and other things. Okay. Whether it was one litigation -- I guess you will have to identify at some point when you are talking about the memo. And if it was also the threat of other litigation of why this was being done if you want to have privileges asserted.

But that there would be some reasoned way in maintaining the documents particularly if any of these individuals were going to be deposed or were deposed in that litigation, which I don't know or not, what documents they had in connection with their depositions or discovery.

I find it hard to believe that everything just went back into some photocopying of some general archive without further description. And I don't know what custodian of records would know if they are still around or not from '98 as to what was done or not.

I don't know if any of the individuals continued to then, were given back or maintained their files because it says photoscopies were made. I don't know if your archives are the photocopies or the originals that were provided to you. Do you know?

MR. OOT: The legacy archive is the legacy

```
archive of all talc-related litigation that was
1
 2
    scanned in years before this case was filed.
 3
            JUDGE WOLFSON: But I guess where I'm going
    back to and I don't think I'm getting answers to and I
 4
 5
    think you need to do a better job of is what's
    reflected at least in the footnote is that they
 6
 7
    photocopied documents that they received from each of
 8
    these individuals.
            So I have two questions: What did they do
 9
    with the photocopies? What happened to the originals
10
    that these individuals maintained? Do you have an
11
12
    answer to that?
13
            MR. OOT: It went back to the legacy archive,
14
    which was scanned in.
15
            JUDGE WOLFSON: You said they went back.
    originals went back? You took them from each of the
16
17
    individuals and took custody of them, J&J, instead of
    maintaining them with the individuals?
18
            MR. OOT: From what I understand, the
19
20
    information that was in those boxes was scanned into
21
    this very large legacy archive that is searchable
22
    and --
23
            JUDGE WOLFSON: And what happened to the
24
    documents themselves?
25
            MR. OOT: I don't know, your Honor.
```

```
JUDGE WOLFSON: You need an answer to that.
1
 2
    That's sufficient information here because that's part
 3
    of what I'm asking you, too. What happened to them?
    Were they returned to those individuals that they
 4
    could still keep their files? Were they destroyed
 5
    once they were scanned and put in the archives?
 6
 7
            I want those answers and you are going to give
8
    them to them. This is part of how the documents were
 9
    preserved or not and identifying then where they are.
            And now what you are telling me is, the way
10
    they went into these archives, not by identifying them
11
12
    as coming from a particular individual. Correct?
13
            MR. OOT: Correct.
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Do you have somebody who was
14
    around in '98 who is telling you this stuff?
15
16
            MR. OOT: No, your Honor. I'll see what I can
17
    do.
18
            JUDGE WOLFSON: That's not helpful if you're
    trying to figure it out today that you think this is
19
20
    what they did, that's not a good answer for me. Maybe
21
    there is nobody around anymore that was there in '98.
    Even Mr. Williams was still around in '98 and is still
22
23
    doing it now.
24
            MR. OOT: I know what the endgame is, your
25
    Honor. I'm just not familiar with the process of how
```

they got there.

JUDGE WOLFSON: From my perspective J&J has not adequately addressed this issue on the documents. The questions that I'm asking you that you don't have answers to give me pause.

Now, what else do you want?

MR. TISI: There's two things I just want to clarify. As I read the memo, they had boxes of documents there. The lawyers went in and photocopied documents for whatever reason, criteria they used to photocopy documents, and then labeled them in the manner described in footnote 1. Presumably, they retained them. What we originally sought was access to the boxes themselves because we had understood -
JUDGE WOLFSON: I know your questions. Look, we don't have to go around the block on this. I've already said it. So everybody is clear, guess what, we're on the record today, so that we're very clear,

I need somebody if they are still around, and surely the lawyers are that could be helpful in this, or whatever custodians because we know they had to give them instructions. I would assume they gave instructions to some custodians as to what to do.

We're talking about two different things.

is exactly what was done in '98.

One is, I also don't know whether a decision was made, and the lawyers would have to tell us that, whether a decision was made to only photocopy some of the documents. Because all it says is, "Our coding system for the source of the documents that we had photocopied is as follows."

They may have made a selection of documents they wanted to photocopy. It may not have been the entire universe of documents that they were given by these individuals. I need an answer to that. Was it a selective exercise?

Two, I understand you said the scanning. But what happened to the documents themselves? Were they returned to the various individuals who had maintained them? Were they destroyed? Were they put somewhere else? We need answers to that.

And then, similarly, then what the instructions were, what the custodians of these records did and how they maintained them to either isolate certain ones, identify certain ones, and if that was done and if we can create that?

We do have issues here if there was any destruction of documents or not and what exists and that's what they are trying to figure out. So we need answers to those questions.

MR. OOT: Yes, your Honor.

JUDGE WOLFSON: Okay. Next.

Now, again, I would consider that a discovery issue which is something that would go to Judge Pisano to resolve. But I'm telling you, what I'm really trying to do today is, as I said, I think that some of these issues I'm addressing have not been adequately looked at and addressed by counsel.

And before presenting them in a helter-skelter way to Judge Pisano and delaying, I want to make sure that I'm telling you the things that I would deem to be relevant and pertinent so that this can be presented to him in a reasoned fashion.

I understand I think you have a conference set up in early October with him. You have a month almost to put this together and get it right and get them to him so that he could start moving.

The reason for putting a master is expeditious resolution, somebody who is going to give you the time, which obviously Judge Goodman can't give you all the time and that's why we're doing this and why I went this route.

I want to save the time in this next month by getting these issues ripe for him and not have him have to go back and tell you I need this and this.

And also from my perspective because ultimately if one of you wants to appeal his decision because they are R and Rs, you know where I am coming from.

The memo itself is another issue. That you can present to him for an R and R. As I said to you, I think we need more information on that as well, both in the creation of it, and I really wanted to know what this Coker case was. I thought you would come in and tell me today. Is it an ovarian cancer case or was it something else that we were talking about?

I don't know what was going on in '98, if there were other litigations being threatened and if they were ovarian cancer cases being threatened or not? I don't know. But that all goes to the idea of the imminent litigation. But on its face it appears to be a document that could be protected.

But then I need to know how it was protected and the measures that were undertaken. Not I. Let Judge Pisano do it first. He used to be a Magistrate Judge, too. So I think he will remember those days.

The museum artifacts. Have you had some more time to talk about this?

MS. SHARKO: Yes. Mr. Placitella and I have been talking. We'll continue to talk. He has new things he wants to build on to resolution of the

know who can.

museum artifacts and make it a broader or more global issue.

other samples and things that you were discussing?

MS. SHARKO: Yes. I think I understand what it is he wants and I told him I would hopefully get back to him later this week. I've been handicapped by the hurricane and vacations and watching this issue expand. But I understand I think where he is and hopefully we can resolve it and if we can't then we

JUDGE WOLFSON: Okay.

MR. PLACITELLA: So just to give it some background. This is the offer that I made to try to not have the Court deal with the All Writs Act and all those complicated things.

This arose because there were lawyers in the asbestos cases who made broad discovery requests not just for what was in the museum but beyond that. And because I have two sides of my brain working here, one that does asbestos cases because I am the co-chair of the Asbestos Litigation Group for all the plaintiffs' lawyers and then liaison counsel in the ovarian cases, I have a universe of knowledge of what the issues are.

The issue is, I thought -- and remember I said

```
this on the phone -- I thought the issue was broader
1
 2
    than just artifacts because the original request by
 3
    the asbestos lawyers was more than that.
            So what I said to Susan was, Look, I'll go to
 4
 5
    the asbestos lawyers. It will take me many, many
 6
    hours, probably 30 hours of phone calls to try to work
 7
    out a deal, so to speak, where all the samples will go
 8
    in one place and be under one custodian for the
    plaintiffs in both sets of cases.
 9
            But don't make me do that twice. Don't make
10
    me do that for what's in the museum and then go back
11
12
    and try to do that again, because when I call the
13
    lawyer up in California and say, Would you agree to do
14
    this, the first question they are going to ask me is,
    Well, what about the other samples I asked for?
15
    I'm not going to have an adequate response for that.
16
17
            JUDGE WOLFSON: I understand. You are still
    talking and she's now considering it. Correct?
18
19
            MR. PLACITELLA: Right.
20
            JUDGE WOLFSON: So that you can try to come up
    with some more global agreement to both the museum
21
22
    artifacts as well as the other samples.
```

MR. PLACITELLA: Right.

23

24

25

MS. SHARKO: Yes. The relation has been evolving and I understand -- I think we shouldn't lay

```
this all out on the record at this point. We should
1
 2
    just try and resolve it.
 3
            JUDGE WOLFSON: I didn't want to hear all the
    specifics. You are talking, talk, talk, and then
 4
    we'll see where we are.
 5
 6
            But I do understand that the idea is that you
 7
    are going to work something out that would include all
 8
    the lawyers so that we are not dealing with some of
    these issues that are a little more problematic about
 9
    asking for injunctions with other courts, but instead
10
    some cooperative effort among all the lawyers to work
11
12
    this out. So go for it. That's what you should be
13
    doing.
14
            MR. PLACITELLA: I'm trying. The related
    issue that I spoke to Susan about a number of times --
15
16
    she didn't want me to bring it up, but I think I
17
    should -- is the following.
18
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Remember, you want to be
    friends.
19
20
            MS. SHARKO: I think we can resolve issues.
21
    If we can't resolve them, then bring them to the
22
    Court. But coming in and giving you an update isn't
23
    really productive in my view.
```

MR. PLACITELLA: As part of this process, your Honor, there are documents that have been produced in

24

```
the asbestos cases that we believe should have been
1
 2
    produced here.
 3
            JUDGE WOLFSON: What are the asbestos cases?
            MR. PLACITELLA: They are people who are
 4
    claiming they have mesothelioma from applying and
 5
    using asbestos containing Johnson & Johnson talc and
 6
 7
    Shower To Shower. Those are the allegations.
 8
            JUDGE WOLFSON: That is not an MDL. Correct?
            MR. PLACITELLA: Correct. They are individual
 9
    state court cases. There is an MDL, but very few of
10
11
    those are in the MDL which is in Philadelphia.
12
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Fine. I've got it. Have a
13
    seat.
14
            Imerys is working out its issue on samples?
15
            MR. SILVER: Judge, we just got the official
    request on Friday. We are doing investigations. We
16
17
    are meeting and conferring and we will continue to do
18
    so.
19
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Okay.
20
            Now, we can go off the record for a couple of
21
    minutes.
22
            (Discussion off the record.)
23
24
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Let me go on the record.
25
            While we were off the record, we discussed
```

```
some of the timing. And what I've indicated is, at this point I would like the document discovery completed within 60 days and all written discovery within 90 days.
```

I'm now going to identification of experts in areas of expertise and, Ms. Parfitt, I'll hear from you.

MS. PARFITT: Thank you, your Honor.

Again, the difficulty the plaintiffs have at this moment in providing you a specific date is the issue with regard to the asbestos and the sampling. There will obviously be some experts who that may be an area and a topic that they will be addressing.

Again, the scope of where we are going, I think we're going to know a little bit more in the 60 days that you are talking about as to which experts that we have identified for certain purposes may be able to go into that area as well.

So we wouldn't want to provide the Court with a name and general areas of specialty and leave out a topic, because that would be terribly helpful to the Court. So I think that's what we're trying to identify, your Honor.

There has been this lapse of time where we really haven't moved forward. We've tried. I'm not

saying there hasn't been effort on both sides. But I think we have a lot of clarity today. I think what your Honor has done last week and today has provided both sides with tremendous clarity as to where we are going, and a lot of the disputes which have prevented us from going forward will be resolved.

We do in fact have a meeting with Judge Pisano on October 4th.

JUDGE GOODMAN: Don't we have a conference October 5?

MS. PARFITT: We do. Judge Pisano could not be available on the 5th. So what we have agreed, we were interested and he was interested in meeting the parties. So we've decided on October 4th and that was confirmed this morning and all parties are available.

We will be well prepared to present to Judge
Pisano what our issues are. We will all work in
earnest to identify where there are discovery disputes
remaining now that we have, again, some clarity from
the Court.

I guess what I would ask at this point is very difficult to say to your Honor having not seen what that additional discovery looks like, because frankly and candidly while there have been efforts by all parties to try to get to the place we are today, there

is still a lot that remains.

The Court has just given us 60 days, 90 days. I think everybody understands what their marching orders are. We certainly understand the breadth of that. I think Judge Pisano on the 4th will identify areas as well and make recommendations on how far we can go. We'll get that information to our experts.

I will advise the Court, we haven't been sitting back and not working with experts. We are. We have in earnest as I represented to the Court a few months ago. We started that process because we are identifying new experts as well.

And as your Honor indicated, there may be some the Court is familiar with. But for the most part there will be new experts that the Court hasn't seen reports or heard about. So I think it will take a little bit of time on our part to digest the new documents that we are getting.

Some of the depositions that have not been taken, and certainly with regard to the issue of whether or not it's pure talc or not pure talc and the parties dispute that, that's a contested issue and will make a difference to these experts who have to give opinions. I don't know where we are on that.

So while I would like in this moment to be

able to give a date certain, I think even in another 30 days we'll probably be in a better position to report to the Court as to when we might be able to present that with the Court. I don't think it's helpful just to give you names. I would like to be able to give you identity and know myself how far, what the breadth of those reports may be.

A lot of what's still in contest here are the test samples of the asbestos and it's a big issue because up to now we've had a talc and ovarian case. The exploration of discovery has been with regard to non-asbestos. That's a big issue here. We have to get some clarity on that. We're doing that. We're moving forward. I'm optimistic that even in 30 days, we're in a better place than where we are today.

JUDGE WOLFSON: Okay. Ms. Sharko.

MS. SHARKO: I would ask that your Honor set a deadline now. We have been here for almost a year.

During that time the plaintiffs have continued to try case after case in Missouri. They've identified the California case. They prepared it. They got experts. They had a California version of a Daubert hearing and tried the case.

The California coordinated proceedings started about the same time as this MDL. The same lawyers for

1 | the plaintiffs are handling all this litigation.

There were asbestos allegations and expert theories in the California case. They have made those allegations

4 in the Missouri cases.

The witnesses they want to depose are not people who are going to answer these questions definitively if there are depositions. There will be more documents produced, but they have a lot of documents.

And this new issue of sampling, the sampling issue was as to other than the museum thing was raised for the first time in the last week or two in my discussions with Mr. Placitella. And the discovery plaintiffs are talking about identified every sample ever known to human kind and what happened to it going back to the flood. Those requests were served Friday night.

So I'm really, really concerned about the delay here and not getting to the ultimate issue, which is why at every hearing I've asked for a <u>Daubert</u> hearing. I know we need experts. Your Honor has set some deadlines for discovery and we will try our best to live up to them and to resolve the remaining issues so we can get to <u>Daubert</u>. But I do think it's fair and appropriate and time for the plaintiffs to

identify their experts.

MS. PARFITT: Your Honor, if I may be heard on one point of clarification.

The California trial I was trial case there as well. The California case did not involve asbestos.

I did want there to be clarity there. It did not involve asbestos.

Your Honor, the point that Ms. Sharko -- Ms.

Sharko makes my argument. With regard to the discovery that your Honor has just discussed with us with great clarity, the discovery issues that your Honor has had with Judge Pisano will move us forward. We are not interested in protracting.

Your Honors have not just one case in front of them. You have all of the federal cases that are being filed across this country. There will be some with asbestos, some without. And Your Honor I think has approached this in the right way. You don't want redo. You want depositions that are taken one time, hopefully not twice. You want experts that are taken one time, hopefully not twice.

We will work in earnest to do that. There is no reason for us to delay. Your Honor, we have clients who are dying. So if there is any party who is interested in the reports we are and I don't want

our reluctance or my inability to state at this moment when we will produce those experts.

JUDGE WOLFSON: Remember, I'm not talking about expert reports. All I'm talking about was identifying experts and the subjects on which they are going to opine. I'm not asking for their opinions.

So I would like to see those experts identified and the subjects on which -- look, I understand by the time they submit their report, there may be additional things that they'll want to talk about.

I'm not going to limit you in that first identification you may not have identified an area and now you've decided that person does want to talk about this. When you give the report, that's the final notice of what they're saying. So that's okay. So don't feel that you are going to be stuck and that's what your concern is. You're not.

I want to have those experts identified and the general subjects within 60 days.

MS. PARFITT: Your Honor, two questions.

JUDGE WOLFSON: Yes.

MS. PARFITT: The identity of the experts, their specialty, and in general are you talking like a paragraph of what they might be testifying to?

```
JUDGE WOLFSON: I'm not even talking about a
1
 2
    real summary of their opinions here. You are going to
    talk about the areas of expertise, and if that
 3
    particular expert is going to talk about talc causing
 4
    ovarian cancer, whatever, if this one is going to talk
 5
 6
    about asbestos fibers can cause ovarian cancer, if
 7
    this one is going to talk about an analysis of talc
 8
    and whether it's pure or not, whatever, so that we
    understand those subjects they are discussing without
 9
    giving me their actual opinion.
10
            MS. PARFITT: Second question: Are the
11
12
    defendants in a position then to also identify simply
    names?
13
14
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Not until they see yours
    because they want to know what they have to respond
15
    to. It's always defendants are second.
16
17
            MS. PARFITT: I understand that. But will
    there be 30 days thereafter that the defendants --
18
            JUDGE WOLFSON: I'll give them a date once you
19
    identify yours when they come in and they'll know they
20
21
    have to be prepared for that. To some extent they may
22
    not even know until they see your reports, though. So
23
    we have to talk about that, how it works. At least
24
    they will know the areas.
25
            MS. PARFITT: The reason I say that, your
```

```
Honor, is the argument that counsel has that certainly
1
 2
    we should know who those people are, they know the
 3
    general areas and topics that have been presented in
    these cases, too. I understand we go first.
 4
 5
    understand that completely.
 6
            JUDGE WOLFSON: I think there may be some new
 7
    areas as you've identified. So what's been tried in
 8
    Missouri or what's been tried in California may not
         It's only a subset of what you might be doing.
 9
    So we need to know what that is.
10
            That's what I'm giving you.
11
12
            We can go off the record.
13
            (Discussion off the record.)
14
15
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Let's go back on the record.
    You want to discuss the special master order that you
16
17
    have been conferring on.
            MS. SHARKO: Yes. We had met and conferred --
18
19
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Do you have a copy for me?
            MS. SHARKO: Yes.
20
21
            That's the defense version with the
22
    plaintiffs' red lines from last night and we have
23
    resolved everything except for two sets of red lines.
    "Resolve" meaning either we accept their red lines or
24
25
    we've agreed on compromised language.
```

The two areas at issue are on page 2 of the draft. The first one is in the second full paragraph. The plaintiffs wants all hearings before Judge Pisano to be stenographically recorded by a court reporter. The defense feeling is that that's expensive and -
JUDGE WOLFSON: Oh, please. Look at the case we're talking about. On this one I think it makes sense. If there are certain things that Judge Pisano prefers he wants to do informally, I'll leave that up to him.

But anything that he thinks that he's either

But anything that he thinks that he's either formally ruling on or he wants to hear argument from you on, then there should be a court reporter available because also if there is ultimately to be a review -- I don't know if you've identified Judge Goodman or myself as the one -- we want to know what happened.

So I think the way it should be written is, I think it's subject to Judge Pisano, again, as I said, because there are lots of things we do here even informally that we want to resolve.

So modify language. But I think if it's going to be in the sense of a kind of motion practice or whatever and you are looking for rulings and he may make them orally, yes, definitely have a court

```
48
    reporter.
1
 2
            MS. SHARKO: Okay. So, "May be
    stenographically recorded by a court reporter subject
 3
    to the discretion of the special master"?
 4
            MS. O'DELL: Or, your Honor, "at the request
 5
 6
    of the parties." If it's an issue that's hotly
7
    contested and we believe it likely will be before you,
 8
    your Honor, we'll place you in the order and --
            MS. SHARKO: I'm okay with it.
 9
            JUDGE WOLFSON:
                            That's fine.
10
11
            MS. O'DELL: If we request it, we would like
12
    it to be recorded because obviously sometimes we can
    hear the same conversation --
13
14
            MS. SHARKO: I agreed to that.
15
            JUDGE WOLFSON: She agreed to that language as
    requested by the parties.
16
17
            MS. O'DELL: Okay.
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Next.
18
            MS. SHARKO: The second issue is at the bottom
19
20
    of the page. Judge Pisano told us in our conference
21
    with him that he wanted the ability to speak ex parte
22
    to the parties. The defendants consent to that.
                                                       Wе
23
    put that in the order. The plaintiffs want to
24
    prohibit ex parte communications.
25
            MS. O'DELL: Your Honor, if Judge Pisano would
```

```
like to have an ex parte conversation, we would like
1
 2
    him to just let the parties know whether it's either
 3
    side and have an agreement of the parties in order to
    do that.
 4
 5
            JUDGE WOLFSON: I'm in agreement with that.
 6
    Maybe you want to phrase it a little differently
 7
    because it makes it sound bad. We do it the reverse
 8
    to say, "The special master may communicate ex parte
    with any attorney with the agreement of the parties."
            MS. O'DELL: That's fine, your Honor. Thank
10
11
    you.
12
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Otherwise, it sounds like
13
    they're really taking him to task, though.
14
            MS. ERFLE: Your Honor, does that mean then
15
    one party has veto power over? The way it's worded,
16
    if I understand it, the Judge can make the request and
17
    one party can say, No, we don't want you doing that?
    I think if it's a heads-up, I understand that.
18
    don't think we should control Judge Pisano that way.
19
20
            JUDGE WOLFSON: I understand.
21
            JUDGE GOODMAN: I think it's up to Judge
22
    Pisano. And if he gives notice he may be
23
    communicating with the parties, I think that should be
24
    enough.
25
            MS. O'DELL: Your Honor, we would just like if
```

it's an issue, the opportunity to have notice and to 1 2 object and --3 JUDGE WOLFSON: And let him decide. Absolutely. It doesn't simply mean, I'm telling you 4 I'm doing this and goodbye. You have the right to 5 tell him why you think that it's not a good idea, then 6 7 it's up to him to decide weighing that. So change 8 your language. MS. SHARKO: So I just want to understand how 9 this works. So if Judge Pisano decides he wants to 10 talk to Ms. O'Dell about some issue or get 11 12 clarification, before he can do that, he has to call me and ask me if I have an objection to that? 13 JUDGE WOLFSON: That's only for something 14 15 substantive. If it's obviously like, I'm missing a 16 document, he can have his assistant call and say, I didn't get this. Can you send it to me again? Or I 17 would like a courtesy copy. 18 No, no one needs notice on that. If there is 19 20 a substantive discussion that he for some reason wants 21 to have ex parte, we all understand. If it's not, if 22 it's basically ministerial, no, he doesn't have to 23 give notice. 24 By the way, I don't think he will be the one

making the phone call anyway at that point. It will

25

```
51
1
    probably be his assistant. If there is any
 2
    substantive discussion, there should notice given so
 3
    that anyone could object if they think appropriate.
            Next. What else?
 4
 5
            MS. O'DELL: There is a few more changes we
    agreed to before the conference that we have reached
 6
 7
    agreement and we'll provide a revised version to the
8
    Court.
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Okay. Everything else is
 9
    good?
10
11
            MS. SHARKO: Yes.
12
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Wonderful. So then if you can
13
    do that and we can get it entered, then we know that
14
    you're ready to go. So we'll enter the order
15
            We can go off the record.
16
            (Discussion off the record.)
17
             (Proceedings concluded.)
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

52 1 2 CERTIFICATE 3 4 5 I, Vincent Russoniello, Official United States 6 7 Court Reporter and Certified Court Reporter of the 8 State of New Jersey, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings as taken stenographically by and before me 10 at the time, place and on the date hereinbefore set 11 12 forth. 13 I do further certify that I am neither a relative 14 nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of any of the parties to this action, and that I am neither a 15 relative nor employee of such attorney or counsel, and 16 17 that I am not financially interested in this action. 18 19 20 21 22 23 S/Vincent Russoniello 24 Vincent Russoniello, CCR Certificate No. 675

_	-
h	~

			53
,	6	24:20, 40:11	13:11, 38:6, 38:20, 40:6,
	6	agree [1] - 35:13	45:3, 45:24, 46:3, 46:7,
'70s [1] - 6:7	6 [1] - 1:5	agreed [6] - 25:2, 39:12,	47:1
'98 [8] - 18:4, 26:18,	60 [4] - 38:3, 38:16, 40:2,		
27:19, 29:15, 29:21,	44:20	46:25, 48:14, 48:15,	arguing [1] - 21:14
29:22, 30:19, 33:11	609 [1] - 1:25	51:6	argument [5] - 14:17,
23.22, 66.13, 66.11	= =	agreement [6] - 14:6,	24:21, 43:9, 46:1, 47:12
0	675 [1] - 52:24	35:21, 49:3, 49:5, 49:9,	arms [1] - 17:14
0	-	51:7	arose [1] - 34:17
08608 [1] - 1:8	7	agreements [2] - 10:2,	ARPS [1] - 1:21
	753 [1] - 3:8	10:12	artifacts [4] - 33:21,
1		ALABAMA [1] - 1:13	34:1, 35:2, 35:22
4501 440 4404 40 47	9	allegations [3] - 37:7,	asbestos [18] - 4:13,
1 [9] - 14:9, 14:24, 19:17,		42:2, 42:3	5:25, 27:3, 34:18, 34:21,
20:9, 20:11, 20:12, 24:2,	90 [2] - 38:4, 40:2		
24:13, 30:12		ALLEN [1] - 1:12	35:3, 35:5, 37:1, 37:3,
136th [1] - 21:8	Α	allow [2] - 5:5, 23:25	37:6, 38:11, 41:9, 41:12,
16 [1] - 22:8	ability [1] - 48:21	allowed [1] - 11:9	42:2, 43:5, 43:7, 43:17,
16-MD-2738(FLW)(LHG	• • •	allowing [1] - 10:10	45:6
[1] - 1:2	able [6] - 17:14, 26:20,	almost [4] - 17:10, 24:19,	Asbestos [1] - 34:22
1997/1998 [1] - 20:3	38:18, 41:1, 41:3, 41:6	32:15, 41:18	ASHCRAFT [1] - 1:14
1998 [10] - 17:4, 17:13,	ABOVE [1] - 3:11	alternative [4] - 5:11,	Ashton [1] - 19:19
	ABOVE-ENTITLED [1] -	5:12, 5:16, 8:11	asserted [1] - 27:8
17:17, 20:23, 22:11,	3:11	America [1] - 2:13	assistant [2] - 50:16,
22:15, 22:24, 25:9,	absolutely [1] - 50:4	AN [1] - 3:9	51:1
25:23, 25:25	accept [1] - 46:24		
	access [1] - 30:13	analysis [1] - 45:7	associations [2] - 13:17,
2	accounting [1] - 22:6	ANN [1] - 2:12	13:23
2 [2] - 24:4, 47:1	accurate [1] - 52:9	answer [5] - 28:12, 29:1,	assume [1] - 30:23
20 [1] - 24:20		29:20, 31:10, 42:6	assuming [1] - 6:18
	ACCURATE [1] - 3:9	answers [5] - 28:4, 29:7,	attention [1] - 16:20
2008 [1] - 8:21	Act [1] - 34:15	30:5, 31:16, 31:25	attorney [3] - 49:9,
2017 [1] - 1:5	ACTION [1] - 1:2	anticipated [1] - 21:14	52:14, 52:16
22nd [3] - 22:3, 23:2,	action [2] - 52:15, 52:17	anticipation [1] - 21:1	August [2] - 22:3, 23:2
24:10	actual [1] - 45:10	anyway [2] - 6:20, 50:25	available [6] - 18:4, 18:5,
26(b)(5)(B [2] - 15:19,	add [2] - 9:8, 9:10	apart [1] - 18:23	18:6, 39:12, 39:15,
16:5	added [1] - 8:13	appeal [1] - 33:2	47:14
26(b)(5)(B) [2] - 15:25,	additional [3] - 19:24,		aware [1] - 24:6
20:15	39:23, 44:10	appear [1] - 25:15	= =
28 [1] - 3:8	addressed [3] - 18:18,	appearances [1] - 4:3	AXELROD [2] - 2:7, 2:7
- []	30:3, 32:8	applies [1] - 16:5	_
3	addressing [2] - 32:7,	apply [5] - 12:21, 12:23,	В
	38:13	12:24, 13:5, 15:21	background [1] - 34:14
30 [4] - 35:6, 41:2, 41:14,		applying [1] - 37:5	BACON [1] - 1:19
45:18	adequate [2] - 16:22,	approached [1] - 43:18	bad [1] - 49:7
	35:16	appropriate [3] - 12:18,	Bates [1] - 22:9
4	adequately [3] - 15:14,	42:25, 51:3	BE [1] - 3:9
402 [1] - 1:8	30:3, 32:7	archive [7] - 25:3, 25:21,	
44 [1] - 19:20	advise [1] - 40:8	27:17, 27:25, 28:1,	BEASLEY [1] - 1:12
	advisory [2] - 7:5, 7:9	28:13, 28:21	becomes [1] - 17:9
4th [3] - 39:8, 39:14, 40:5	Affidavit [1] - 21:4	archived [1] - 18:2	beginning [1] - 4:21
_	affidavit [3] - 15:3, 21:1,		Behalf [2] - 1:17, 2:8
5	21:2	archives [8] - 19:9,	behalf [2] - 1:22, 2:13
5 [1] - 39:10	agencies [1] - 13:16	19:12, 19:13, 25:16,	BEISNER [1] - 1:21
588-9516 [1] - 1:25	agendas [1] - 16:16	27:23, 29:6, 29:11	best [1] - 42:22
5:30 [1] - 17:20		area [3] - 38:13, 38:18,	better [4] - 4:8, 28:5,
5:50 [1] - 17:25 5th [1] - 39:12	ages [1] - 26:7	44:13	41:2, 41:15
Jul [1] - 33.12	ago [4] - 6:5, 23:10,	areas [11] - 11:21, 12:8,	,

concerns [3] - 17:2,

between [1] - 9:20 beyond [2] - 10:24, 34:19 **bi** [1] - 19:22 **bi-monthly** [1] - 19:22 bias [1] - 5:4 **BIDDLE** [1] - 1:18 **big** [2] - 41:9, 41:12 **Bill** [2] - 19:19, 21:6 bit [4] - 19:5, 22:2, 38:15, 40:17 block [1] - 30:16 **Board** [3] - 7:24, 8:2, 8:3 boards [1] - 7:9 **body** [1] - 5:25 bottle [1] - 8:13 **bottom** [1] - 48:19 box [3] - 17:23, 19:3, 25:22 boxes [22] - 18:1, 19:4, 19:5, 19:14, 19:18, 19:20, 19:24, 20:5, 20:7, 20:21, 21:20, 22:6, 22:10, 23:6, 23:9, 23:10, 23:14, 24:1, 24:12, 28:20, 30:8, 30:14 brain [1] - 34:20 breadth [2] - 40:4, 41:7 briefed [2] - 13:17, 18:20 briefing [1] - 15:4 bring [4] - 16:14, 21:17, 36:16, 36:21 Bristol [1] - 14:7 Bristol-Myers [1] - 14:7 broad [2] - 10:25, 34:18 **broadening** [1] - 4:20 broader [3] - 4:16, 34:1, 35:1 brought [2] - 16:19, 19:15 build [1] - 33:25 **BY** [10] - 1:13, 1:14, 1:16, 1:18, 1:20, 1:21, 2:6, 2:7, 2:10, 2:12

С

California [8] - 35:13, 41:21, 41:22, 41:24, 42:3, 43:4, 43:5, 46:8 cancer [16] - 7:10, 8:5, 9:14, 10:4, 11:8, 11:9, 12:10, 20:3, 20:8, 24:7, 26:17, 33:9, 33:13, 45:5,

45:6 candidly [5] - 19:5, 20:22, 22:1, 22:5, 39:24 **carcinogens** [1] - 5:25 cardboard [1] - 17:23 care [2] - 17:16, 19:4 careful [1] - 23:17 case [21] - 9:11, 9:17, 12:24, 15:24, 16:14, 16:23, 24:19, 26:17, 28:2, 33:8, 33:9, 41:10, 41:20, 41:21, 41:23, 42:3, 43:4, 43:5, 43:14, 47:6 cases [18] - 10:3, 14:9, 14:10, 14:12, 14:13, 14:14, 14:22, 33:13, 34:18, 34:21, 34:23, 35:9, 37:1, 37:3, 37:10, 42:4, 43:15, 46:4 categorize [1] - 19:25 categorized [1] - 19:18 category [1] - 6:18 causation [1] - 5:7 causes [1] - 20:2 causing [1] - 45:4 **CCR** [3] - 1:24, 3:16, 52:24 certain [7] - 16:12, 17:6, 31:20, 38:17, 41:1, 47:8 certainly [5] - 4:15, 10:15, 40:4, 40:20, 46:1 **Certificate** [1] - 52:24 Certified [1] - 52:7 **CERTIFIED** [1] - 3:9 certify [2] - 52:8, 52:13 cetera [1] - 5:19 chain [1] - 18:7 chair [1] - 34:21 change [1] - 50:7 changes [1] - 51:5 **Chris** [1] - 16:9 **CHRIS** [1] - 1:15 CHRISTOPHER [1] -1:16 **circulation** [1] - 25:20 **CIVIL** [1] - 1:2 civil [1] - 12:24 claiming [1] - 37:5 **claims** [1] - 18:23 clarification [3] - 10:19, 43:3, 50:12

clarify [1] - 30:8

clarity [7] - 12:6, 39:2, 39:4, 39:19, 41:13, 43:6, 43:11 **CLARKSON** [1] - 1:7 clauses [1] - 9:24 claw [3] - 15:24, 16:6, 16:13 clear [4] - 4:13, 26:7, 30:17, 30:18 clearly [1] - 15:7 **CLERK** [1] - 4:1 clients [1] - 43:24 **close** [1] - 5:23 closed [1] - 6:2 **closure** [1] - 5:18 closures [1] - 6:6 co [1] - 34:21 co-chair [1] - 34:21 coded [1] - 24:12 coding [6] - 20:17, 20:19, 21:11, 25:10, 25:15, 31:4 **COHEN** [1] - 1:16 Coker [8] - 20:25, 21:5, 21:11, 26:16, 26:19, 33:8 collected [2] - 17:12, 20:1 collection [1] - 24:18 Colorado [1] - 13:25 coming [4] - 24:15, 29:12, 33:3, 36:22 comments [2] - 6:12, 15:6 Committee [1] - 1:17 **committees** [1] - 7:5 communicate [1] - 49:8 communicating [1] -49:23 communications [4] -7:11, 7:25, 8:8, 48:24 Communications [1] company [2] - 24:3, 24:6 **completed** [1] - 38:3 completely [1] - 46:5 **complicated** [1] - 34:16 **compromised** [1] - 46:25 concern [4] - 15:11, 24:17, 27:2, 44:18 concerned [2] - 24:5, 42:18 **concerning** [1] - 9:21

18:15, 20:22 concluded [1] - 51:17 CONFERENCE [1] - 1:4 conference [8] - 11:14, 16:21, 23:20, 24:10, 32:14, 39:9, 48:20, 51:6 conferences [2] - 18:22, 22:22 conferred [2] - 25:2, 46:18 conferring [3] - 13:6, 37:17, 46:17 confirm [1] - 18:9 confirmed [1] - 39:15 confused [1] - 12:5 **connection** [3] - 7:18, 15:2, 27:13 consent [1] - 48:22 consider [1] - 32:3 considering [2] - 7:9, 35:18 construed [1] - 4:22 consultants [2] - 7:6, 7:8 containing [2] - 23:15, 37:6 contest [1] - 41:8 contested [2] - 40:22, 48:7 continue [4] - 15:25, 21:19, 33:24, 37:17 continued [2] - 27:21, 41:19 contracts [2] - 9:20, 9:24 control [1] - 49:19 **conversation** [2] - 48:13, **cooperative** [1] - 36:11 coordinated [1] - 41:24 **copy** [4] - 17:18, 20:9, 46:19, 50:18 cornstarch [4] - 5:10, 8:10, 8:12 correct [9] - 6:20, 6:25, 13:12, 25:12, 29:12, 29:13, 35:18, 37:8, 37:9 **COUGHLIN** [1] - 2:9 counsel [8] - 20:5, 21:4, 22:25, 32:8, 34:23, 46:1, 52:14, 52:16 country [1] - 43:16 County [1] - 21:9 couple [2] - 14:10, 37:20

COURT [3] - 1:1, 1:25, Court [19] - 16:2, 16:15, 16:17, 21:8, 34:15, 36:22, 38:19, 38:22, 39:20, 40:2, 40:8, 40:10, 40:14, 40:15, 41:3, 41:4, 51:8, 52:7 court [10] - 20:13, 23:12, 23:13, 24:15, 37:10, 47:4, 47:13, 47:25, 48:3 Court's [1] - 16:20 courtesy [1] - 50:18 COURTHOUSE [1] - 1:7 courts [1] - 36:10 create [1] - 31:21 creation [1] - 33:7 criteria [1] - 30:10 CRR [1] - 1:24 curious [1] - 5:20 custodian [2] - 27:18, custodians [3] - 30:22, 30:24, 31:18 custody [2] - 18:7, 28:17

D

D.C [3] - 1:20, 1:21, 2:6 dark [1] - 26:6 Darlene [1] - 21:5 date [4] - 38:10, 41:1, 45:19, 52:11 dated [1] - 22:19 Daubert [3] - 41:22, 42:20, 42:24 days [10] - 33:20, 38:3, 38:4, 38:16, 40:2, 41:2, 41:14, 44:20, 45:18 deadline [1] - 41:18 deadlines [1] - 42:22 deal [5] - 10:7, 11:25, 13:7, 34:15, 35:7 dealing [1] - 36:8 deceased [3] - 8:19, 8:20, 8:21 decide [3] - 12:19, 50:3, 50:7 decided [2] - 39:14, 44:14 decides [1] - 50:10 decision [3] - 31:1, 31:3, 33:2

14:14, 14:16, 14:18 **Defendant** [3] - 1:22, 2:8, 2:13 defendants [6] - 9:20, 10:1, 45:12, 45:16, 45:18, 48:22 defendants' [1] - 9:21 defense [5] - 9:13, 16:25, 17:1, 46:21, 47:5 definitely [1] - 47:25 **definition** [1] - 8:22 definitively [1] - 42:7 degree [2] - 8:25, 9:3 delay [2] - 42:19, 43:23 delaying [1] - 32:10 delineated [1] - 25:22 demonstrates [1] - 17:11 depose [2] - 11:20, 42:5 deposed [3] - 13:10, 27:11 depositions [9] - 11:17, 11:19, 11:23, 12:2, 13:8, 27:14, 40:19, 42:7, described [4] - 18:24, 19:18, 25:9, 30:12 **describes** [1] - 19:10 description [2] - 18:6, 27:17 design [2] - 5:16, 8:11 destroy [1] - 14:19 destroyed [2] - 29:5, 31:15 destruction [1] - 31:23 difference [1] - 40:23 different [4] - 18:2, 25:11, 25:23, 30:25 differently [1] - 49:6 difficult [1] - 39:22 difficulty [1] - 38:9 digest [1] - 40:17 direction [1] - 11:3 **Director** [1] - 7:24 **Directors** [2] - 8:2, 8:3 discover [8] - 5:14, 6:1, 6:4, 7:11, 9:1, 9:23, 11:10, 14:3 discoverable [2] - 10:21, 11:5 discovered [1] - 10:6

decisions [1] - 5:23

defendant [4] - 6:18,

deem [1] - 32:11

discovery [25] - 4:9, 4:20, 7:12, 10:10, 10:18, 11:16, 11:25, 12:2, 12:9, 12:14, 13:4, 13:7, 18:12, 27:14, 32:3, 34:18, 38:2, 38:3, 39:18, 39:23, 41:11, 42:13, 42:22, 43:10, 43:11 discretion [1] - 48:4 discuss [1] - 46:16 discussed [2] - 37:25, 43:10 discussing [2] - 34:4, 45:9 discussion [6] - 16:7, 37:22, 46:13, 50:20, 51:2, 51:16 discussions [2] - 27:2, 42:13 dispute [3] - 6:19, 9:12, 40:22 disputes [4] - 10:8, 11:21, 39:5, 39:18 **District** [1] - 21:8 **DISTRICT** [2] - 1:1, 1:1 diversity [1] - 14:19 document [17] - 8:10, 15:8, 15:23, 16:3, 16:7, 16:19, 16:22, 17:10, 19:7, 19:25, 20:6, 20:14, 22:11, 22:15, 33:16, 38:2, 50:16 documents [61] - 6:13, 6:24, 7:11, 7:17, 7:20, 8:14, 9:3, 9:16, 11:17, 17:6, 17:12, 17:13, 17:16, 17:21, 17:24, 18:9, 18:24, 19:2, 20:7, 20:18, 21:18, 21:21, 21:24, 22:10, 22:13, 22:18, 22:25, 23:5, 23:8, 24:5, 24:12, 24:18, 25:4, 25:5, 25:9, 25:11, 25:15, 25:19, 25:20, 26:9, 26:13, 26:25, 27:10, 27:13, 28:7, 28:24, 29:8, 30:3, 30:9, 30:10, 30:11, 31:4, 31:5, 31:7, 31:9, 31:13, 31:23, 36:25, 40:18, 42:8, 42:9 done [16] - 4:24, 13:19, 16:14, 16:16, 18:2, 18:8, 20:4, 21:1, 21:10, 26:6,

26:8, 27:7, 27:19, 30:19, 31:21, 39:3

DOTRO [1] - 2:10

doubt [1] - 4:14

draft [1] - 47:2

drill [1] - 6:13

Drill [1] - 6:23

DRINKER [1] - 1:18

DUFFY [1] - 2:9

during [1] - 41:19

dying [1] - 43:24

Ε

early [1] - 32:15 earnest [3] - 39:18, 40:10, 43:22 **EAST** [1] - 1:8 effort [2] - 36:11, 39:1 efforts [2] - 17:20, 39:24 eight [2] - 19:24, 22:8 either [4] - 31:19, 46:24, 47:11, 49:2 emails [1] - 23:20 employed [1] - 8:18 **employee** [2] - 52:14, 52:16 end [1] - 22:24 endgame [1] - 29:24 enter [3] - 14:8, 14:23, 51:14 entered [1] - 51:13 entire [1] - 31:9 entities [2] - 5:2, 13:24 **ENTITLED** [1] - 3:11 entitled [2] - 16:6, 20:14 entity [1] - 9:20 enunciated [1] - 12:8 **ERFLE** [3] - 2:12, 8:21, 49:14 **ESQUIRE** [13] - 1:13, 1:14, 1:15, 1:16, 1:18, 1:20, 1:21, 2:6, 2:7, 2:10, 2:10, 2:12, 2:12 **ESQUIRES** [10] - 1:12, 1:14, 1:16, 1:18, 1:19, 1:21, 2:5, 2:7, 2:9, 2:11 essentially [1] - 15:23 et [1] - 5:19 Europe [1] - 13:17 **evidence** [1] - 9:4 evolving [1] - 35:25 ex [5] - 48:21, 48:24,

49:1, 49:8, 50:21 exact [1] - 10:7 exactly [4] - 10:25, 16:1, 16:15, 30:19 example [2] - 17:4, 17:5 except [1] - 46:23 exercise [1] - 31:11 **Exhibit** [2] - 14:9, 14:24 exist [6] - 18:1, 20:21, 21:19, 21:20, 23:10, 24:8 existed [2] - 17:17, 24:6 existing [1] - 15:24 exists [1] - 31:23 expand [1] - 34:9 **expeditious** [1] - 32:18 **expensive** [1] - 47:5 expert [3] - 42:2, 44:4, 45:4 expertise [2] - 38:6, 45:3 experts [18] - 5:14, 38:5, 38:12, 38:16, 40:7, 40:9, 40:12, 40:15, 40:23, 41:21, 42:21, 43:1, 43:20, 44:2, 44:5, 44:7, 44:19, 44:23 **explanation** [1] - 18:6 exploration [1] - 41:11 extent [1] - 45:21

F

face [2] - 15:8, 33:15 facilities [1] - 5:19 fact [2] - 16:16, 39:7 fair [2] - 12:9, 42:24 fairly [1] - 15:3 familiar [2] - 29:25, 40:14 far [2] - 40:6, 41:6 fashion [2] - 26:15, 32:13 February [1] - 16:21 federal [1] - 43:15 few [3] - 37:10, 40:10, 51:5 fibers [1] - 45:6 FIELD [1] - 2:12 figure [4] - 26:5, 26:8, 29:19, 31:24 file [1] - 22:20 filed [4] - 14:14, 15:23, 28:2, 43:16 files [7] - 19:15, 19:24, 21:18, 23:15, 26:14,

27:22, 29:5 final [1] - 44:15 financially [1] - 52:17 fine [3] - 37:12, 48:10, 49:10 **FIRM** [1] - 2:7 first [14] - 12:1, 13:7, 15:18, 16:4, 20:6, 23:4, 24:23, 25:8, 33:19, 35:14, 42:12, 44:12, 46:4, 47:2 **FISHER** [1] - 1:7 **FLOM** [1] - 1:21 flood [1] - 42:16 **FOLLOWING** [1] - 3:9 following [3] - 4:6, 24:10, 36:17 follows [1] - 31:6 footnote [5] - 20:9, 20:17, 24:13, 28:6, 30:12 **FOR** [1] - 1:1 foregoing [1] - 52:9 foreign [2] - 13:15, 13:23 formally [1] - 47:12 forth [1] - 52:12 forward [5] - 14:20, 38:25, 39:6, 41:14, 43:12 frankly [3] - 15:4, 20:18, 39:23 Frazier [1] - 23:3 **FREDA** [1] - 1:9 Friday [3] - 17:20, 37:16, 42:16 friends [1] - 36:19 front [2] - 16:12, 43:14 frustrating [1] - 22:2 full [1] - 47:2

G

Galligher [1] - 19:21 game [1] - 12:9 Gene [1] - 21:4 general [10] - 10:6, 10:10, 10:20, 12:9, 26:14, 27:16, 38:20, 44:20, 44:24, 46:3 GEREL [1] - 1:14 given [5] - 4:3, 27:21, 31:9, 40:2, 51:2 glad [1] - 15:20 global [2] - 34:1, 35:21 goodbye [1] - 50:5 Goodman [2] - 32:20, 47:16 GOODMAN [4] - 1:10, 19:1, 39:9, 49:21 GORDON [1] - 2:11 great [1] - 43:11 gritty [1] - 14:4 Group [1] - 34:22 groups [1] - 5:2 guess [8] - 7:15, 13:4, 13:9, 14:17, 27:4, 28:3, 30:17, 39:21

handicapped [1] - 34:7

handling [1] - 42:1

hard [1] - 27:15

HARDY [1] - 1:19 heads [1] - 49:18 heads-up [1] - 49:18 hear [4] - 36:3, 38:6, 47:12, 48:13 heard [2] - 40:16, 43:2 hearing [3] - 41:22, 42:20, 42:21 hearings [1] - 47:3 help [1] - 25:7 helpful [4] - 29:18, 30:21, 38:21, 41:5 helter [1] - 32:9 helter-skelter [1] - 32:9 hereby [1] - 52:8 hereinbefore [1] - 52:11 herring [1] - 19:6 **Honor** [53] - 5:22, 7:1, 8:23, 9:6, 9:10, 11:1, 13:14, 14:13, 15:17, 15:20, 16:1, 16:24, 17:22, 18:19, 20:20, 21:16, 22:5, 22:21, 22:23, 23:22, 24:2, 24:17, 24:22, 25:13, 25:17, 26:3, 26:21, 28:25, 29:16, 29:25, 32:1, 36:25, 38:8, 38:23, 39:3, 39:22, 40:13, 41:17, 42:21, 43:2, 43:8, 43:10, 43:12, 43:17, 43:23, 44:21, 46:1, 48:5, 48:8, 48:25, 49:10, 49:14, 49:25

HONORABLE [2] - 1:9, 1:10 Honors [2] - 16:9, 43:14 hopefully [4] - 34:6, 34:10, 43:20, 43:21 hotly [1] - 48:6 hours [2] - 35:6 human [2] - 25:4, 42:15 hurricane [1] - 34:8

i.e [1] - 9:25 idea [4] - 26:18, 33:14, 36:6, 50:6 identification [2] - 38:5, 44:13 identified [9] - 4:16, 38:17, 41:20, 42:14, 44:8, 44:13, 44:19, 46:7, 47:15 identify [9] - 26:10, 27:4, 31:20, 38:23, 39:18, 40:5, 43:1, 45:12, 45:20 identifying [5] - 13:11, 29:9, 29:11, 40:12, 44:5 identity [2] - 41:6, 44:23 **Imerys** [7] - 2:13, 6:15, 6:19, 8:8, 8:17, 10:1, 37:14 imminent [1] - 33:15 impact [2] - 4:23, 7:19 important [7] - 5:5, 15:20, 16:18, 17:9, 20:1, 21:17, 24:2 impression [2] - 22:3, 22:12 IN [2] - 1:4, 3:10 in-state [1] - 14:15 inability [1] - 44:1 Inc [1] - 21:6 include [1] - 36:7 included [2] - 13:25, 15:3 includes [1] - 4:17 including [1] - 19:22 increasing [1] - 11:8 indemnity [3] - 9:24, 10:2, 10:11 indicate [1] - 27:1 indicated [3] - 24:13, 38:1, 40:13 individual [2] - 29:12,

37:9 individuals [11] - 25:12, 26:13, 27:11, 27:20, 28:8, 28:11, 28:17, 28:18, 29:4, 31:10, 31:14 influence [1] - 4:25 **informally** [2] - 47:9, 47:21 **information** [6] - 4:17, 5:23, 28:20, 29:2, 33:6, 40:7 initial [1] - 15:5 initials [1] - 25:10 **injunctions** [1] - 36:10 inquiry [1] - 18:3 instance [4] - 5:1, 23:21, 23:23, 26:12 instead [4] - 4:6, 4:8, 28:17, 36:10 instructed [2] - 16:24, 16:25 **instructions** [3] - 30:23, 30:24, 31:18 intent [1] - 4:9 interest [1] - 4:21 interested [5] - 39:13, 43:13, 43:25, 52:17 interviewed [1] - 19:15 investigations [1] -37:16 involve [2] - 43:5, 43:7 involved [3] - 4:25, 5:2, 15:12 involving [1] - 10:4 irrelevant [1] - 19:5 **IS** [1] - 3:9 isolate [1] - 31:20 issue [43] - 5:4, 5:5, 6:25, 7:9, 9:6, 9:11, 9:17, 11:15, 13:14, 13:22, 14:4, 15:4, 16:21, 17:16, 17:22, 18:8, 18:19, 20:2, 22:24, 23:12, 24:7, 30:3, 32:4, 33:4, 34:2, 34:8, 34:25, 35:1, 36:15, 37:14, 38:11, 40:20, 40:22, 41:9, 41:12, 42:10, 42:11, 42:19, 47:1, 48:6, 48:19, 50:1, 50:11 issued [1] - 16:13 issues [20] - 5:7, 7:13,

7:17, 10:18, 11:3, 13:2, 13:10, 15:12, 18:22, 24:19, 27:2, 31:22, 32:7, 32:24, 34:24, 36:9, 36:20, 39:17, 42:23, 43:11 itself [3] - 19:8, 22:24, 33:4

J

J&J [11] - 4:17, 5:1, 5:20,

6:14, 6:17, 7:2, 7:4,

15:14, 23:15, 28:17,

Jefferson [1] - 21:9

job [2] - 18:12, 28:5

JOHNSON [2] - 1:4

10:1, 21:7, 37:6

joined [1] - 14:19

Johnson [8] - 1:22, 9:25,

joint [2] - 13:17, 13:22

32:4, 32:10, 32:20,

33:19, 33:20, 39:7,

39:11, 39:16, 40:5,

47:19, 48:20, 48:25,

49:16, 49:19, 49:21,

JUDGE [85] - 4:2, 4:5,

5:17, 6:5, 6:10, 6:16,

6:23, 7:2, 7:14, 7:23,

8:6, 8:15, 8:18, 8:22,

11:11, 11:15, 11:19,

14:2, 14:17, 14:23,

17:15, 17:25, 19:1,

20:10, 20:16, 20:24,

21:23, 24:21, 24:24,

25:7, 25:14, 25:18,

28:15, 28:23, 29:1,

29:14, 29:18, 30:2,

35:17, 35:20, 36:3,

37:19, 37:24, 39:9,

25:25, 26:4, 26:22, 28:3,

30:15, 32:2, 34:3, 34:12,

36:18, 37:3, 37:8, 37:12,

41:16, 44:3, 44:22, 45:1,

9:19, 10:5, 10:23, 11:6,

12:4, 12:7, 12:13, 12:23,

50:10

Judge [26] - 10:9, 10:21,

14:5, 18:16, 23:13, 26:4,

43:12, 47:3, 47:8, 47:15,

JERSEY [1] - 1:1

Jersey [1] - 52:8

JOHN [1] - 1:21

30:2

45:14, 45:19, 46:6, 46:15, 46:19, 47:6, 48:10, 48:15, 48:18, 49:5, 49:12, 49:20, 49:21, 50:3, 50:14, 51:9, 51:12 judge [1] - 37:15 Judicial [1] - 21:8

K

jump [1] - 16:2

keep [1] - 29:5 kept [1] - 26:13 key [1] - 21:16 keyed [1] - 22:11 kind [3] - 7:3, 42:15, 47:23 kinds [2] - 23:8, 26:15 knowing [1] - 21:22 knowledge [2] - 4:17, 34:24 known [2] - 24:3, 42:15

L

labeled [2] - 25:10, 30:11

label [1] - 26:9

labor [1] - 22:17 language [5] - 16:11, 46:25, 47:22, 48:15, 50:8 lapse [1] - 38:24 large [3] - 25:3, 25:21, 28:21 last [9] - 4:10, 12:12, 12:13, 18:21, 24:9, 39:3, 42:12, 46:22 lawyer [2] - 26:2, 35:13 lawyers [10] - 30:9, 30:21, 31:2, 34:17, 34:23, 35:3, 35:5, 36:8, 36:11, 41:25 lay [1] - 35:25 least [4] - 24:11, 26:25, 28:6, 45:23 leave [5] - 10:8, 10:12, 11:13, 38:20, 47:9 legacy [6] - 25:3, 25:21, 27:25, 28:13, 28:21 **LEIGH** [1] - 1:13 letter [10] - 4:7, 13:18, 13:22, 17:7, 17:18, 17:19, 17:20, 18:23,

liability [1] - 10:3 liaison [1] - 34:23 likely [1] - 48:7 limit [1] - 44:12 limited [3] - 4:12, 10:16, 15:4 limits [1] - 12:15 lines [3] - 46:22, 46:23, 46:24 listed [1] - 14:9 litigating [1] - 23:11 litigation [14] - 15:7, 17:7, 20:25, 21:2, 25:23, 26:16, 26:19, 26:24, 27:4, 27:6, 27:12, 28:1, 33:15, 42:1 **Litigation** [1] - 34:22 **litigations** [1] - 33:12 live [1] - 42:23 located [1] - 25:5 location [2] - 17:21, 25:5 **LOCKE** [1] - 2:6 logs [2] - 6:13, 6:23 LOIS [1] - 1:10 Look [1] - 35:4 look [11] - 10:13, 18:21, 19:7, 19:10, 20:8, 20:11, 23:22, 30:15, 44:8, 47:6 looked [4] - 23:16, 23:18, 23:19, 32:8 looking [1] - 47:24 looks [1] - 39:23 **LORNA** [1] - 2:10

24:9, 24:13

M

Magistrate [2] - 26:4, 33:19 maintained [5] - 26:11, 27:21, 28:11, 31:14, 31:19 maintaining [2] - 27:10, 28:18 manner [1] - 30:12 marching [1] - 40:3 MARK [1] - 2:10 marked [1] - 20:8 market [1] - 9:15 **MARKETING** [1] - 1:4 master [6] - 14:3, 18:12, 32:18, 46:16, 48:4, 49:8 materials [1] - 24:18

matter [2] - 16:15, 21:5 **MATTER** [1] - 3:11 matters [6] - 4:23, 10:6, 10:16, 10:20, 11:4, 12:17 **MDL** [4] - 37:8, 37:10, 37:11, 41:25 **MEAGHER** [1] - 1:21 mean [3] - 7:7, 49:14, 50:4 meaning [1] - 46:24 meantime [1] - 23:11 measures [1] - 33:18 meeting [3] - 37:17, 39:7, 39:13 meetings [1] - 7:5 Mehaffey [1] - 15:1 Mehaffey-Weber [1] -15:1 memo [17] - 15:1, 15:2, 17:4, 18:24, 19:8, 19:10, 20:9, 20:10, 20:12, 22:19, 22:24, 22:25, 23:15, 25:13, 27:5, 30:8, 33:4 memory [1] - 13:24 mesothelioma [1] - 37:5 met [2] - 25:1, 46:18 **MICHELLE** [1] - 1:14 might [3] - 41:3, 44:25, 46:9 mills [1] - 5:18 mine [3] - 6:1, 6:2, 6:8 Mines [1] - 13:25 mines [9] - 5:18, 5:21, 5:23, 6:13, 6:14, 6:15, 6:24, 7:2, 7:4 ministerial [1] - 50:22 minutes [1] - 37:21 missed [1] - 23:18 missing [2] - 17:24, 50:15 Missouri [3] - 41:20, 42:4, 46:8 modify [1] - 47:22 **Molinar** [1] - 19:23 moment [6] - 11:24, 14:25, 18:13, 38:10, 40:25, 44:1 month [2] - 32:15, 32:23 monthly [1] - 19:22 months [2] - 18:18, 40:11

morning [2] - 24:14, 39:15 most [1] - 40:14 motion [3] - 21:3, 21:14, 47:23 move [1] - 43:12 moved [1] - 38:25 moving [3] - 13:21, 32:17, 41:14 **MR** [38] - 6:21, 7:1, 9:10, 10:19, 15:17, 16:9, 17:18, 18:19, 19:4, 20:11, 20:13, 20:20, 21:16, 21:25, 24:22, 25:1, 25:13, 25:17, 25:19, 26:2, 26:20, 27:25, 28:13, 28:19, 28:25, 29:13, 29:16, 29:24, 30:7, 32:1, 34:13, 35:19, 35:23, 36:14, 36:24, 37:4, 37:9, 37:15 **MS** [54] - 5:12, 5:22, 6:7, 6:15, 7:8, 7:22, 8:1, 8:9, 8:17, 8:20, 8:21, 8:23, 9:23, 11:1, 11:7, 11:12, 11:16, 12:3, 12:5, 12:8, 12:21, 13:13, 14:12, 14:21, 21:13, 33:23, 34:5, 35:24, 36:20, 38:8, 39:11, 41:17, 43:2, 44:21, 44:23, 45:11, 45:17, 45:25, 46:18, 46:20, 48:2, 48:5, 48:9, 48:11, 48:14, 48:17, 48:19, 48:25, 49:10, 49:14, 49:25, 50:9, 51:5, 51:11 museum [6] - 33:21,

Ν

34:1, 34:19, 35:11,

35:21, 42:11

must [1] - 15:5

Myers [1] - 14:7

MY [1] - 3:10

name [1] - 38:20 names [2] - 41:5, 45:13 NANCY [1] - 2:12 narrow [1] - 10:22 narrowly [1] - 4:22 nature [1] - 10:12 necessarily [2] - 9:18, 17:23

need [16] - 5:14, 5:15, 12:6, 12:10, 13:5, 28:5, 29:1, 30:20, 31:10, 31:16, 31:24, 32:25, 33:6, 33:17, 42:21, 46:10 needs [1] - 50:19 never [1] - 6:25 New [1] - 52:8 **NEW** [1] - 1:1 new [6] - 33:24, 40:12, 40:15, 40:17, 42:10, 46:6 next [4] - 32:2, 32:23, 48:18, 51:4 nice [1] - 26:22 night [2] - 42:17, 46:22 nitty [1] - 14:4 nitty-gritty [1] - 14:4 **NJ** [1] - 1:8 **NO** [1] - 1:2 **nobody** [1] - 29:21 non [1] - 41:12 non-asbestos [1] - 41:12 none [1] - 9:15 normally [1] - 4:7 notebooks [3] - 19:14, 19:21, 23:14 **NOTES** [1] - 3:10 notes [1] - 18:21 nothing [1] - 12:13 notice [6] - 44:16, 49:22, 50:1, 50:19, 50:23, 51:2 number [5] - 4:18, 8:14, 21:7, 25:22, 36:15

O'DELL [28] - 1:13, 5:12,

5:22, 6:7, 6:15, 7:8,

7:22, 8:1, 8:9, 8:17,

8:20, 8:23, 9:23, 11:1,

11:7, 11:12, 11:16, 12:3, 13:13, 14:12, 14:21, 48:5, 48:11, 48:17, 48:25, 49:10, 49:25, 51:5

O'Dell [3] - 22:17, 23:2, 50:11

object [2] - 50:2, 51:3

objection [2] - 13:21, 50:13

objections [1] - 13:5

obtaining [1] - 26:25

obviously [5] - 26:25, 32:20, 38:12, 48:12, 50:15 October [4] - 32:15, 39:8, 39:10, 39:14 **OF** [3] - 1:1, 1:4, 3:10 offer [1] - 34:14 office [1] - 22:18 OFFICIAL [2] - 1:25, 3:16 Official [1] - 52:6 official [1] - 37:15 once [3] - 11:21, 29:6, 45:19 one [30] - 5:9, 15:9, 15:13, 15:16, 18:19, 18:22, 19:10, 21:2, 21:14, 24:6, 27:1, 27:3, 31:1, 33:1, 34:20, 35:8, 43:3, 43:14, 43:19, 43:21, 45:5, 45:7, 47:2, 47:7, 47:16, 49:15, 49:17, 50:19, 50:24 ones [4] - 4:15, 10:24, 31:20 Oot [2] - 23:3, 24:13 **OOT** [19] - 1:20, 10:19, 15:17, 17:18, 20:13, 24:22, 25:1, 25:13, 25:17, 25:19, 26:2, 27:25, 28:13, 28:19, 28:25, 29:13, 29:16, 29:24, 32:1 open [1] - 20:13 opine [2] - 5:15, 44:6 opinion [1] - 45:10 opinions [3] - 40:24, 44:6, 45:2 opportunity [1] - 50:1 optimistic [1] - 41:14 orally [1] - 47:25 order [8] - 4:7, 16:11, 23:13, 46:16, 48:8, 48:23, 49:3, 51:14 ordering [1] - 23:14 orders [1] - 40:4 ore [1] - 5:25 **OREGON** [1] - 2:12 original [1] - 35:2 originally [2] - 25:1, 30:13 originals [3] - 27:24, 28:10, 28:16

otherwise [1] - 49:12

outlined [1] - 17:20 outright [1] - 24:5 outstanding [1] - 13:14 ovarian [14] - 8:5, 10:4, 11:7, 11:9, 12:10, 20:3, 24:7, 26:17, 33:9, 33:13, 34:23, 41:10, 45:5, 45:6 overbroad [1] - 12:19 own [2] - 19:15, 19:23

Р

page [4] - 20:12, 22:8, 47:1, 48:20 paper [2] - 12:12, 12:14 papers [1] - 15:1 paragraph [4] - 19:10, 20:6, 44:25, 47:2 parameters [2] - 10:7, 12:11 Parfitt [1] - 38:6 PARFITT [9] - 1:14, 38:8, 39:11, 43:2, 44:21, 44:23, 45:11, 45:17, 45:25 part [8] - 4:19, 10:3, 22:10, 29:2, 29:8, 36:24, 40:14, 40:17 parte [5] - 48:21, 48:24, 49:1, 49:8, 50:21 particular [4] - 9:6, 16:19, 29:12, 45:4 particularity [1] - 17:1 particularly [2] - 15:6, 27:10 parties [14] - 12:10, 13:19, 39:14, 39:15, 39:25, 40:22, 48:6, 48:16, 48:22, 49:2, 49:3, 49:9, 49:23, 52:15 party [5] - 7:6, 13:9, 43:24, 49:15, 49:17 past [2] - 16:16, 22:22 **PATRICK** [1] - 1:20 pause [2] - 16:4, 30:5 **PCPC** [1] - 2:8 pending [1] - 21:7 PENNSYLVANIA [2] -2:7, 2:12 people [5] - 19:9, 19:15, 37:4, 42:6, 46:2 **performing** [1] - 5:3 perhaps [1] - 4:22 period [1] - 19:8

permit [1] - 10:16 person [3] - 8:14, 11:22, 44:14 personal [2] - 19:23, 26:14 **perspective** [2] - 30:2, pertinent [1] - 32:12 Pharmacy [1] - 21:6 Philadelphia [1] - 37:11 phone [6] - 4:10, 23:3, 24:14, 35:1, 35:6, 50:25 **photocopied** [4] - 25:14, 28:7, 30:9, 31:6 **photocopies** [4] - 21:18, 21:19, 27:23, 28:10 **photocopy** [3] - 30:11, 31:3, 31:8 photocopying [1] - 27:16 photoscopies [1] - 27:22 **phrase** [1] - 49:6 phrases [1] - 22:11 physical [1] - 19:3 piece [2] - 12:12, 12:13 Pisano [20] - 10:9, 10:21, 14:5, 18:16, 32:4, 32:10, 33:19, 39:7, 39:11, 39:17, 40:5, 43:12, 47:3, 47:8, 47:19, 48:20, 48:25, 49:19, 49:22, 50:10 place [6] - 15:16, 35:8, 39:25, 41:15, 48:8, 52:11 Placitella [2] - 33:23, 42:13 **PLACITELLA** [9] - 1:16, 1:16, 34:13, 35:19, 35:23, 36:14, 36:24, 37:4, 37:9 plaintiff [2] - 4:16, 14:15 **Plaintiffs** [1] - 1:17 plaintiffs [12] - 16:10, 16:12, 16:24, 23:25, 35:9, 38:9, 41:19, 42:1, 42:14, 42:25, 47:3, 48:23 plaintiffs' [2] - 34:22, point [15] - 7:16, 9:9, 10:5, 10:19, 14:2, 20:20, 21:16, 23:15, 27:5, 36:1,

38:2, 39:21, 43:3, 43:8,

50:25 position [6] - 8:16, 8:23, 15:18, 21:10, 41:2, 45:12 possibly [1] - 22:20 post [1] - 22:19 post-dated [1] - 22:19 posture [1] - 11:13 **POWDER** [1] - 1:4 powder [7] - 5:24, 6:3, 8:4, 8:11, 9:11, 9:13, power [1] - 49:15 practice [1] - 47:23 **PRACTICES** [1] - 1:5 prefaced [1] - 15:19 prefers [1] - 47:9 prepared [3] - 39:16, 41:21, 45:21 present [5] - 10:9, 18:16, 33:5, 39:16, 41:4 presented [2] - 32:13, 46:3 presenting [1] - 32:9 preservation [1] - 20:23 preserve [1] - 26:9 preserved [1] - 29:9 presumably [2] - 21:19, 30:12 pretty [1] - 23:17 **prevented** [1] - 39:5 privilege [1] - 18:23 privileged [4] - 15:23, 16:3, 16:8, 20:14 privileges [2] - 15:9, 27:7 problematic [1] - 36:9 procedure [1] - 12:24 proceed [4] - 11:12, 11:17, 11:18, 11:20 proceedings [3] - 41:24, 51:17, 52:10 process [4] - 5:18, 29:25, 36:24, 40:11 produce [5] - 21:22, 21:24, 23:14, 24:11, produced [9] - 15:15, 17:6, 18:5, 18:25, 21:3, 26:15, 36:25, 37:2, 42:8 **producing** [1] - 15:15 product [7] - 5:13, 5:16, 7:18, 8:17, 9:12, 9:14,

production [4] - 11:17, 16:22, 22:7, 22:13 productions [1] - 17:2 productive [1] - 36:23 **PRODUCTS** [1] - 1:4 products [9] - 5:10, 5:24, 6:3, 7:10, 8:4, 8:12, 9:15, 9:22, 11:8 prohibit [1] - 48:24 proportionality [1] -12:22 protected [4] - 15:9, 20:19, 33:16, 33:17 protections [2] - 15:14, 16:13 **protracting** [1] - 43:13 provide [2] - 38:19, 51:7 provided [4] - 22:4, 23:25, 27:24, 39:3 providing [1] - 38:10 pull [1] - 22:13 pulled [6] - 20:5, 20:6, 21:18, 21:21, 22:18, 24:12 purchased [1] - 9:21 purchases [1] - 9:25 purchasing [1] - 10:1 pure [10] - 8:22, 8:24, 9:1, 9:2, 9:4, 9:9, 9:15, 40:21, 45:8 **purpose** [1] - 17:8 purposes [1] - 38:17 **PURSUANT** [1] - 3:8 pursuing [1] - 14:11 put [6] - 20:25, 22:13, 29:6, 31:15, 32:16, 48:23 putting [1] - 32:18

Q

questions [7] - 11:22, 28:9, 30:4, 30:15, 31:25, 42:6, 44:21 **quite** [1] - 15:10

R

raised [1] - 42:11 raising [1] - 13:2 range [2] - 19:20, 22:9 ranges [1] - 25:5 Ray [1] - 21:5 RE [1] - 1:4

re [1] - 13:3 **re-reviewing** [1] - 13:3 reached [2] - 14:6, 51:6 reaction [1] - 15:5 read [2] - 15:1, 30:8 reading [2] - 20:13, 24:14 ready [1] - 51:14 real [4] - 14:18, 18:8, 24:17, 45:2 realize [1] - 16:5 really [17] - 5:6, 5:9, 7:20, 15:10, 16:5, 17:9, 17:11, 18:3, 20:19, 22:24, 32:5, 33:7, 36:23, 38:25, 42:18, 49:13 reason [8] - 4:19, 16:18, 17:9, 30:10, 32:18, 43:23, 45:25, 50:20 reasoned [2] - 27:9, 32:13 reasons [1] - 17:5 **REATH** [1] - 1:18 received [1] - 28:7 recommendation [1] -18:17 recommendations [1] -40:6 record [13] - 4:5, 19:9, 30:18, 36:1, 37:20, 37:22, 37:24, 37:25, 46:12, 46:13, 46:15, 51:15, 51:16 recorded [3] - 47:4, 48:3, 48:12 records [2] - 27:18, 31:19 recreate [2] - 22:6, 23:25 red [4] - 19:6, 46:22, 46:23, 46:24 redo [1] - 43:19 **REES** [1] - 2:11 reference [1] - 24:15 referenced [4] - 22:14, 22:25, 23:5, 23:7 references [2] - 26:12, 27:1 reflect [2] - 7:17, 25:11 reflected [1] - 28:6 reflecting [1] - 7:20 regard [8] - 6:18, 14:6, 14:8, 34:3, 38:11, 40:20, 41:11, 43:9

regarding [2] - 5:23, 8:25 regulatory [3] - 13:15, 13:23, 19:13 relate [1] - 9:25 related [9] - 7:2, 7:17, 13:22, 15:18, 20:2, 20:7, 24:19, 28:1, 36:14 relates [4] - 7:8, 11:7, 12:9, 13:14 relating [2] - 8:3, 24:7 relation [2] - 11:1, 35:24 relative [2] - 52:13, 52:16 relevance [1] - 5:9 relevant [2] - 10:14, 32:12 relitigate [2] - 11:3, 11:14 reluctance [1] - 44:1 remaining [2] - 39:19, remains [1] - 40:1 remand [1] - 14:11 remember [5] - 16:18, 33:20, 34:25, 36:18, report [4] - 18:16, 41:3, 44:9, 44:15 **REPORTER** [2] - 1:25, 3:16 **Reporter** [2] - 52:7 reporter [4] - 47:4, 47:13, 48:1, 48:3 reports [6] - 23:20, 40:16, 41:7, 43:25, 44:4, 45:22 represent [1] - 23:16 representations [1] -8:25 represented [5] - 22:4, 22:5, 23:12, 23:24, 40:10 representing [2] - 22:21, 22:22 request [9] - 7:12, 8:1, 13:13, 24:16, 35:2,

37:16, 48:5, 48:11,

requested [1] - 48:16

requests [7] - 10:9,

10:10, 12:18, 13:4,

13:20, 34:18, 42:16

research [1] - 19:13

requirements [1] - 20:23

49:16

reserve [1] - 16:14 resident [1] - 14:14 resolution [2] - 32:19, 33:25 resolve [8] - 32:5, 34:10, 36:2, 36:20, 36:21, 42:23, 46:24, 47:21 resolved [2] - 39:6, 46:23 respond [1] - 45:15 response [2] - 17:19, 35:16 retained [1] - 30:13 retrieved [1] - 19:14 returned [2] - 29:4, 31:14 reverse [1] - 49:7 review [2] - 12:18, 47:15 reviewed [1] - 9:17 reviewer [1] - 25:4 reviewing [1] - 13:3 revised [1] - 51:7 ripe [1] - 32:24 rise [1] - 4:1 risk [1] - 11:9 risks [1] - 8:5 Rosetta [1] - 17:11 **ROTH** [1] - 1:16 route [1] - 32:22 **RPR** [1] - 1:24 **Rs** [1] - 33:3 rule [1] - 15:25 rules [4] - 12:21, 12:23, 12:24, 15:21 ruling [4] - 10:11, 12:15, 14:7, 47:12 rulings [1] - 47:24 **Russoniello** [4] - 3:15, 52:6, 52:23, 52:24 RUSSONIELLO [2] -1:24, 3:16

S

S/Vincent [2] - 3:15, 52:23 safer [3] - 5:12, 5:16, 8:10 safety [2] - 8:4, 8:17 sale [3] - 7:15, 7:18, 7:19 SALES [1] - 1:5 sample [1] - 42:14 samples [7] - 19:22, 34:4, 35:7, 35:15, 35:22, 37:14, 41:9

39.4

SILVER [4] - 2:10, 6:21,

sampling [3] - 38:11, 42:10 save [1] - 32:23 scanned [5] - 25:20, 28:2, 28:14, 28:20, 29:6 scanning [1] - 31:12 School [1] - 13:25 scope [4] - 4:9, 4:10, 10:23, 38:14 searchable [1] - 28:21 seat [1] - 37:13 second [5] - 15:11, 45:11, 45:16, 47:2, 48:19 **SECTION** [1] - 3:8 see [7] - 9:16, 10:13, 29:16, 36:5, 44:7, 45:14, 45:22 seem [1] - 15:7 selection [1] - 31:7 **selective** [1] - 31:11 send [1] - 50:17 sense [2] - 47:8, 47:23 sent [4] - 17:7, 17:19, 23:20, 24:9 separate [1] - 11:24 **SEPTEMBER** [1] - 1:5 served [3] - 13:19, 21:4, 42:16 serves [1] - 13:24 set [5] - 25:10, 32:14, 41:17, 42:21, 52:11 sets [2] - 35:9, 46:23 **SEYFARRTH** [1] - 2:5 **Sharko** [2] - 12:4, 41:16 **sharko** [2] - 43:8, 43:9 **SHARKO** [18] - 1:18, 12:5, 12:8, 12:21, 21:13, 33:23, 34:5, 35:24, 36:20, 41:17, 46:18, 46:20, 48:2, 48:9, 48:14, 48:19, 50:9, 51:11 **SHAW** [1] - 2:5 sheets [1] - 21:12 **SHERYL** [1] - 2:7 **SHOOK** [1] - 1:19 **show** [1] - 9:2 Shower [4] - 7:15, 7:16, 37:7 side [1] - 49:3 sides [3] - 34:20, 39:1,

7:1, 37:15 **similarly** [1] - 31:17 simply [4] - 14:19, 22:12, 45:12, 50:4 **sitting** [1] - 40:9 situation [1] - 11:2 **SKADDEN** [1] - 1:21 skelter [1] - 32:9 **SLATE** [1] - 1:21 snapshot [2] - 17:12, 24:3 someone [1] - 11:20 **sometimes** [1] - 48:12 **somewhere** [1] - 31:15 sorry [2] - 4:13, 6:21 **sought** [1] - 30:13 **sound** [1] - 49:7 sounds [1] - 49:12 **source** [3] - 5:24, 6:3, 31:5 special [3] - 46:16, 48:4, 49:8 specialty [2] - 38:20, 44:24 specific [8] - 5:7, 6:8, 8:1, 10:8, 11:3, 13:2, 13:24, 38:10 specifically [3] - 7:12, 8:4, 9:24 **specifics** [3] - 10:13, 12:16, 36:4 **spouse** [1] - 21:5 **spreadsheet** [8] - 22:4, 22:8, 23:5, 23:7, 23:21, 23:24, 24:24, 25:6 stack [1] - 22:14 start [2] - 4:12, 32:17 started [2] - 40:11, 41:24 **STATE** [1] - 1:8 State [1] - 52:8 state [8] - 14:13, 14:15, 23:12, 23:13, 37:10, 44:1 states [1] - 5:15 **STATES** [2] - 1:1, 1:7 **States** [1] - 52:6 status [4] - 4:7, 16:20, 18:22, 23:19 **STATUS** [1] - 1:4 Steering [1] - 1:17 STENOGRAPHIC [1] -3:10 stenographically [3] -

47:4, 48:3, 52:10 still [13] - 12:23, 14:11, 17:13, 18:5, 20:14, 27:18, 29:5, 29:22, 30:20, 35:17, 40:1, 41:8 stipulation [1] - 14:7 Stone [1] - 17:11 stop [1] - 19:1 **STREET** [1] - 1:8 stuck [1] - 44:17 studies [3] - 4:24, 5:3, 5:4 **stuff** [2] - 23:17, 29:15 subcommittees [1] - 8:3 subject [7] - 10:6, 10:16, 10:20, 12:17, 13:20, 47:19, 48:3 **subjects** [4] - 44:5, 44:8, 44:20, 45:9 **submissions** [1] - 15:13 submit [1] - 44:9 **submitted** [1] - 15:2 subpoena [1] - 14:1 subpoenas [2] - 13:9, 13:20 **subset** [1] - 46:9 subsidiaries [1] - 21:8 substantive [3] - 50:15, 50:20, 51:2 **substituted** [1] - 8:12 **sufficient** [1] - 29:2 suggest [1] - 9:4 **suggested** [1] - 8:10 **suggesting** [1] - 18:11 summary [1] - 45:2 surely [1] - 30:21 **Susan** [2] - 35:4, 36:15 **SUSAN** [1] - 1:18 **system** [4] - 20:18, 25:10, 25:15, 31:5

Т

table [1] - 19:16
talc [24] - 5:12, 5:24,
8:13, 8:22, 8:24, 9:1,
9:2, 9:4, 9:9, 9:16, 9:18,
9:21, 10:1, 19:22, 20:2,
20:7, 24:7, 28:1, 37:6,
40:21, 41:10, 45:4, 45:7
Talc [1] - 2:13
talc-related [1] - 28:1
talcum [7] - 5:24, 6:3,

8:4, 8:11, 9:11, 9:13, 11:8 talks [1] - 22:9 targeted [1] - 7:12 task [1] - 49:13 technology [1] - 25:24 tee [1] - 10:17 tee-up [1] - 10:17 teed [1] - 14:5 teed-up [1] - 14:5 term [1] - 17:10 terms [2] - 11:16, 13:13 terribly [1] - 38:21 test [1] - 41:9 testifying [1] - 44:25 testing [2] - 9:2, 19:22 **Texas** [1] - 21:9 Thames [1] - 21:6 **THE** [7] - 1:1, 1:9, 1:10, 2:7, 3:8, 3:10, 4:1 themselves [4] - 18:1, 28:24, 30:14, 31:13 theories [1] - 42:2 theory [1] - 10:20 thereafter [1] - 45:18 they've [2] - 17:2, 41:20 thinks [1] - 47:11 third [2] - 7:6, 13:9 third-party [2] - 7:6, 13:9 **THOMAS** [1] - 2:6 **THORNTON** [1] - 2:12 threat [1] - 27:6 threatened [2] - 33:12, three [5] - 14:12, 14:21, 16:16, 18:21, 22:22 timelines [1] - 12:1 timing [1] - 38:1 Tisi [2] - 9:8, 16:9 TISI [11] - 1:15, 9:10, 16:9, 18:19, 19:4, 20:11, 20:20, 21:16, 21:25, 26:20, 30:7 tisi [1] - 17:19 **TITLE** [1] - 3:8 **TO** [2] - 3:8, 3:9 today [16] - 10:11, 10:14, 11:4, 11:13, 12:2, 12:16, 18:11, 21:14, 29:19, 30:18, 32:6, 33:9, 39:2, 39:3, 39:25, 41:15 together [1] - 32:16 took [3] - 17:21, 28:16,

28:17 topic [2] - 38:13, 38:21 **topics** [2] - 5:8, 46:3 trade [2] - 13:16, 13:23 transcript [1] - 52:9 **TRANSCRIPT** [2] - 1:4, TRANSCRIPTION [1] -3:10 tremendous [1] - 39:4 **TRENTON** [1] - 1:8 trial [2] - 43:4 tried [4] - 38:25, 41:23, 46:7, 46:8 true [2] - 24:22, 52:9 try [8] - 34:14, 35:6, 35:12, 35:20, 36:2, 39:25, 41:19, 42:22 trying [9] - 11:25, 18:14, 26:5, 26:8, 29:19, 31:24, 32:6, 36:14, 38:22 twice [3] - 35:10, 43:20, 43:21 two [12] - 13:15, 19:17, 23:10, 28:9, 30:7, 30:25, 31:12, 34:20, 42:12, 44:21, 46:23, 47:1

u

U.S [2] - 1:25, 3:16 **U.S.C** [1] - 3:8 ultimate [1] - 42:19 ultimately [2] - 33:1, 47:14 under [5] - 6:17, 15:25, 22:3, 25:13, 35:8 understood [2] - 17:25, 30:14 undertaken [1] - 33:18 unfortunately [1] - 12:6 United [1] - 52:6 **UNITED** [2] - 1:1, 1:7 universe [2] - 31:9, 34:24 up [18] - 10:17, 14:5, 18:20, 18:22, 22:2, 24:10, 25:10, 32:15, 35:13, 35:20, 36:16, 41:10, 42:23, 47:9, 49:18, 49:21, 50:7 update [1] - 36:22 usage [1] - 6:9 **USDJ** [1] - 1:9 **USMJ** [1] - 1:10

vacations [1] - 34:8

Valeant [1] - 7:16

various [3] - 19:21, 20:7, 31:14

version [3] - 41:22, 46:21, 51:7

veto [1] - 49:15

view [1] - 36:23

views [1] - 18:15

VINCENT [2] - 1:24, 3:16

Vincent [2] - 52:6, 52:24

violate [1] - 15:25

violation [1] - 15:19

VIRGINIA [2] - 1:14, 1:15

volume [1] - 25:3

35:17, 35:20, 36:3, 36:18, 37:3, 37:8, 37:12, 37:19, 37:24, 41:16, 44:3, 44:22, 45:1, 45:14, 45:19, 46:6, 46:15, 46:19, 47:6, 48:10, 48:15, 48:18, 49:5, 49:12, 49:20, 50:3, 50:14, 51:9, 51:12 women [1] - 6:9 wonderful [1] - 51:12 worded [1] - 49:15 works [3] - 26:5, 45:23, 50:10 Writs [1] - 34:15 written [6] - 11:25, 12:2, 13:4, 13:7, 38:3, 47:18 wrote [1] - 8:10

W

waiver [1] - 15:18 wants [9] - 23:22, 33:2, 33:25, 34:6, 47:3, 47:9, 47:12, 50:10, 50:20 warning [1] - 8:13 WASHINGTON [3] -1:20, 1:21, 2:6 watching [1] - 34:8 Weber [1] - 15:1 week [5] - 4:10, 24:10, 34:7, 39:3, 42:12 weeks [1] - 23:10 weighing [1] - 50:7 whole [1] - 21:10 **Williams** [5] - 15:3, 20:25, 21:4, 26:23, 29:22 witnesses [1] - 42:5 **WOLFSON** [83] - 1:9, 4:2, 4:5, 5:17, 6:5, 6:10, 6:16, 6:23, 7:2, 7:14, 7:23, 8:6, 8:15, 8:18, 8:22, 9:19, 10:5, 10:23, 11:6, 11:11, 11:15, 11:19, 12:4, 12:7, 12:13, 12:23, 14:2, 14:17, 14:23, 17:15, 17:25, 20:10, 20:16, 20:24, 21:23, 24:21, 24:24, 25:7, 25:14, 25:18, 25:25, 26:4, 26:22, 28:3, 28:15, 28:23, 29:1,

29:14, 29:18, 30:2, 30:15, 32:2, 34:3, 34:12,

Υ

year [2] - 19:8, 41:18 years [2] - 24:20, 28:2

Ζ

Zazenski [2] - 8:8, 8:9 **zone** [1] - 6:9